

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

AN ENQUIRY INTO THAT SYSTEM
WITH REGARD TO ITS ECONOMY AND MORALITY

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

AN ENQUIRY INTO THAT SYSTEM
WITH REGARD TO
ITS ECONOMY AND MORALITY

BY

R. USSHER

AUTHOR OF

'THE COLONIZATION OF THE FIJI ISLANDS' "CREMATION
"THE HISTORY OF CROXALL" ETC.

LONDON
GIBBINGS & CO., LIMITED
18, BURY STREET, W.C.
1898

every Society where individuality will be strongly developed, in every Society where wealth will be largely subdivided, the birth rate will tend to become equal with the means of subsistence, and will not have, as in the past, an element of fear and terror."—NITTI, *Population and the Social System*.

"THE study of social questions is one of the noblest pursuits which can engage the thoughts of those who strive to follow in the footsteps of Christ."—*Lambeth Decrees*, 1887.

PREFACE

I book is not intended for the scientific, who are more or less familiar with the writings of the great economists.

It is intended for the less highly educated, who seem to be led astray by the specious and superficial arguments of the Neo-Malthusians.

There seems to be little doubt that the great evil, both moral and economic, which this book is intended to combat, is enormously increasing in England and foreign countries.

I trust that what I have written in the following pages will, in some degree, be the means of checking immoral practices which are fraught with very great danger both to the individual and the nation, and which transform the moral condition of marriage into simple monogamic prostitution.

The subject is one which is looming largely in the immediate future. All classes—rich and poor, idle and working—seem to be rapidly adopting artificial checks to procreation, which are urged upon them by the Neo-Malthusians; and it seems to me that the only way in which they can be brought to see their grave mistake is by means of simple instruction

in the elements of Political Economy, so far as it relates to the subject, and Sociology.

A full discussion of the so-called advantages of Neo-Malthusianism cannot but be productive of much good to those primarily concerned.

I have only to add that it is obvious that this book is not intended to be placed within the reach of boys and girls, and that it is written from the Christian point of view.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE HISTORY OF THE MATTER IN ENGLAND . . .	I
NEO-MALTHUSIANISM NOT THE TEACHING OF THE REV. T. R. MALTHUS (1766-1834)	13
THE ARGUMENT OF THE NEO-MALTHUSIANS	29
THE EVILS OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM	55
NEO-MALTHUSIANISM WITH REGARD TO POPULATION . . .	105
THE EXCUSES FOR NEO-MALTHUSIANISM REMOVED	
BY A REFORM IN GENERAL EDUCATION	165
BY A REFORM IN MARRIAGE	193
NEO-MALTHUSIANISM WITH REGARD TO THE LAND QUESTION .	253
EMIGRATION CONSIDERED AS A HELP TO REDUCE AN EXCESS OF POPULATION	289
TEMPERANCE CONSIDERED IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO NEO- MALTHUSIANISM	300
CO-OPERATIVE HOMES CONSIDERED AS A HELP AGAINST NEO- MALTHUSIANISM	319

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

THE HISTORY OF THE MATTER IN ENGLAND

THE subject which we are to consider in the following pages is that which is now generally known by the name of Neo-Malthusianism. This term, inaccurate as it is, in simple words means the prevention, by artificial checks, of the procreation of children ; in scientific, the control of fertilization by men and women. Its advocates declare that it is to be the greatest power of the future, one which will remove all poverty and misery, and that modern society is adopting the practice so largely, that this most desirable object is being attained much more rapidly than they could have imagined. It is not quite a new idea in England. It was alluded to in certain newspapers so long ago as the year 1827. About the same time anonymous handbills advising the adoption of the practice were widely distributed throughout the North of England. A little later on we find that lectures on the matter were given in Leeds and elsewhere, which were attended by very many of both sexes. Soon afterwards there appeared Carlile's *Every Woman's Book*, warmly advocating the system, and minutely describing the various means by which it could be carried into effect. The literature of the subject did not largely increase during the middle of the century.

The elder Mill advocated the system in his article "Colony" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 8th edition ; also in his *Elements of Political Economy*, "Care taken that children, beyond a certain number, shall not be the fruit," see pp. 34 and 44. John Stuart Mill, as many are no doubt aware, following his father's example, was an enthusiastic advocate of

the system, and wrote of it in his *Political Economy*, which now meets with but doubtful approval, to say the least. Cannan describes it as a "collection of old essays produced from a drawer, and published without alteration."

It was not until the *Fruits of Philosophy* was published between 1870 and 1880 that the more modern treatment of the subject was reached. This publication was soon followed by Mrs. Besant's well-known book, *The Law of Population, its Consequences, and its Bearing upon Human Conduct and Morals*. Then followed in rapid succession a large number of books, pamphlets, and treatises, dealing with the subject, such as *Notes on the Population Question; The Physiology of Marriage; Poverty: its Cause and Cure; Moral Physiology; Individual, Family, and National Poverty; Elements of Social Science; The Population Question; The Wife's Handbook; Artificial Checks to Population: is the teaching of them Infamous? English and French Morality; The Duties of Parents; The Strike of a Sex; The Prosperity of the French Peasant; The Malthusian Magazine*, founded as the organ of the Malthusian League. The first Number appeared on February 1st, 1872. In addition to these works on the subject, there is an immense mass of anonymous literature now flooding the country in all directions, treating of the same. Magazine articles and letters, for or against the system, have appeared in *The Economic Review, The Christian World, The National and Church Reformers, The North American Review, The Humanitarian, The Free Review*, etc., etc. Some of these will be referred to in the course of the following pages. There have also appeared certain other articles in various magazines bearing on sexual relationship, which will be referred to also, but which do not deal directly with the matter in hand. I think the above list comprehends most of the chief literature of the subject. The most distinguished writers on the subject are Mill, Ward, Owen, Gaskell, Besant, Greg, Matthew Arnold, Drysdale, and Clapperton. The matter is alluded to in *The Evolution of Sex*, in *The Church and the World*, and in Lea's *Christian Marriage*. Numerous foreign writings on the subject will also be touched upon in the course of the argument. Of all the works enumerated above the one which undoubtedly caused the greatest interest and sensation was *The Fruits of Philosophy*, by Dr. Charles Knowlton, of Boston, U.S.A., which found its way into the possession of

the publishers of *The National Reformer*, which publication was then, 1878, under the joint control of Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant.

Dr. Knowlton's book had been known in England for some years previous to this, having been published in America in the year 1835, and had been sold in Bristol by a man named Cook, who, however, had used it for obscene purposes, which was not the object for which the writer had published it. The publisher of *The National Reformer* was prosecuted for exposing it for sale. He pleaded guilty, but Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant then took the case out of his hands, and defended themselves in the Courts. All the legal proceedings which followed only caused the book to have much more publicity than it otherwise would have had. Opposition and persecution, as they always do, only drew more general attention to the matter, which might otherwise have been left in obscurity. The Neo-Malthusian practices advocated in the pages of the book were new to the general public, and because of this it was eagerly read, and obtained a very large circulation in a comparatively short space of time. The ill effects of that abortive prosecution bear their fruits still; if it had not taken place very many would never have been initiated into this nefarious system, which I hope to show in the following pages is a disastrous one both for the individual and the nation to adopt. Ever since the year 1878, in which these two events occurred, the birth-rate of the United Kingdom has fallen. It commenced to do so in that year, and has steadily continued doing so ever since that time. It has never reached what it was previous to the Bradlaugh trial. We are now becoming quite accustomed to the ever-recurring remark in the Registrar-General's returns, "This is the lowest birth-rate ever recorded." Nitti, in his most instructive work on population, which all should study, comments on this as follows: "This singular phenomenon, the decline of the birth-rate in the United Kingdom, which contradicts all the dictates of classic economy with regard to population, found a strange coincidence in the campaign opened in 1878 by the so-called School of Neo-Malthusianism." The serious decline in the birth-rate of the United Kingdom can clearly be traced, in the first instance, to the injudicious prosecution of Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant. Their trial, with all its accompanying nauseous details, caused a book which had been originally

written with only a medical object in view, certainly not to be read by an ignorant public, and which had, up to their trial, lain in a well-deserved obscurity, to have altogether a fictitious value and importance, and, moreover, which was much to be deprecated, a very wide circle of unreasoning and ignorant readers. "The noisy process which only served to diffuse the incriminated theory." It penetrated into hundreds of thousands of households, which now for the first time became acquainted with a system and teaching which had previous to this been only whispered about by a comparatively few unimportant persons. "This campaign did not create the situation, but it gave it a great incentive, because it openly advocated a custom which had previously been only carried out in secret." (Mille in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, December 18th, 1891.) He there largely treats of the results of the prosecution and its effects. Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant were summoned before Mr. Alderman Figgins, who committed them both for trial, but allowed bail. Mr. Bradlaugh carried the case before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, and moved for a writ of error. That Judge said he would grant it, if, after having read the book, in conjunction with Mr. Justice Mellor, he should think its object was the legitimate one of promoting knowledge on a matter of human interest. The writ was granted. At the ensuing trial the Lord Chief Justice summed up strongly for an acquittal, saying "that a more ill-advised and more injudicious proceeding in the way of a prosecution had never been brought before a Court of Justice." The verdict, however, was that the book had a tendency to deprave public morals, but the defendants were entirely exonerated from any corrupt motive in publishing it. The jury said that the book recommended immoral practices, but not obscene in the sense of exciting sexual passion. This led to a verdict of guilty, but it was afterwards quashed. The legal action in the whole matter came to nothing, and now there seems, at first sight, nothing to prevent any books on similar topics being published—to these the advertising columns of certain newspapers bear ample witness, but it must be borne in mind that they should have a philanthropic, not an obscene object. They must not recommend sexual immorality. It yet remains to be legally decided whether publicly advocating Neo-Malthusianism, in the manner of certain publications of to-day, is an offence

against public morals or not. It is somewhat difficult, after having studied Stephens' *Criminal Digest*, to understand why some of these pamphlets, now poured out in multitudes, are not inhibited. They merely suggest and advocate the practice of Neo-Malthusianism to young men and women as a means by which they can gratify sexual desire without having to fear the birth of children. It seems to me that the whole matter, repugnant as it may be, will sooner or later have to be enquired into, and legally decided one way or the other. It seems monstrous that young women, in no matter what degrees of life, should be the free recipients, by post, of these pamphlets, as so many thousands are now. How far the advocacy and publication of some of these systems can go without coming under the law of procuring abortion is a nice legal point, and it certainly will have to be considered sooner or later. Some of these pamphlets merely treat of the most efficacious means of procuring early miscarriage. When the point of law was decided in Mr. Bradlaugh's and Mrs. Besant's favour the *Fruits of Philosophy* was withdrawn, and Mrs. Besant substituted her own book on the subject for it, that well-known one, *The Law of Population: its Consequences and Bearing on Human Conduct and Morals*. It had an immense circulation and sale, until she withdrew it on becoming a Theosophist in April 1891. "It was translated into every language, and read by millions of persons." (Mille.) "Issued in 200,000 copies, reproduced in the newspapers, defended with ardour, the new publication did not delay in finding its effects, more especially amongst persons who had already begun to secretly practise that which the Malthusians publicly advocate. This campaign, carried on with such ardour, naturally produced results within a very short time. Neo-Malthusianism did not appeal to elevated instincts or noble feelings; it was neither more nor less than a brutal affirmation of individual egoism. Well-conditioned working-men, seeing in the absence or scarcity of children a means of putting an end between them and the lower middle class; and these knowing they had to rely upon a small income, feared that a large family might reduce them to the condition of working men; people who were independent, desirous of maintaining their social position—all accepted it enthusiastically." (Nitti.)

Mrs. Besant says she was offered a large sum for the copy-right, but now having been led by Madame Blavatsky to

see her error in writing it, she refused to accept it, and withdrew the book from circulation. She somewhat plaintively remarks in her autobiography, "I know now that I was wrong intellectually, and blundered in the remedy." She also truly observes that to advocate Neo-Malthusianism is merely to put one evil into the place of another. "Then the very apostles of the Neo-Malthusian practices appeared to be dismayed by the effects which their propaganda had produced, and some of them even wished to withdraw. Mrs. Annie Besant honestly declared that her experience of Neo-Malthusianism doctrines had convinced her that the practices suggested by the Neo-Malthusian League were contrary to the best interests of the nation itself, as well as to those of morality; that while on the one hand they hindered every development of the more educated feelings, on the other hand they weakened and unfitted the people of Great Britain for the struggle of life." (Nitti.) Mille comments on the lightness of heart with which Mrs. Besant withdrew her book, and the frightful responsibility which she had incurred by writing it.

"*Declarer qu'avoir prêché de gaieté de cœur la stérilité du mariage est une œuvre tout simplement monstrueuse.*" She is corroborated in her latest opinion on Neo-Malthusianism by Miss Clapperton, the talented authoress of *Scientific Meliorism*, who, although herself an ardent Neo-Malthusian, declares "we must not dream that by universal adoption of Neo-Malthusianism our social miseries would at once be removed. On the contrary, fresh complications would arise."

Mrs. Besant regrets that she wrote her book dealing with the subject in the United Kingdom, but we must always bear in mind that progress and information on such an important matter as Neo-Malthusianism undoubtedly is, touching social and national life in their most serious relationships, can only be reached by means of the fullest discussion, and after a very complete study of all the arguments capable of being brought forward in its favour or against it. The day for ignoring all the complex and tremendous issues of our increased population, with all their far-reaching results, has long since passed away, ever since the time that Harriet Martineau passed through her martyrdom for having touched upon it. We have learned a great deal of the value of free speech for both sexes since her time.

Social problems are forcing their way to the front, and they

must be solved. When we come to realize the fact that England and Wales alone are now adding a thousand every twenty-four hours to the population of the world, and London three hundred, a million every ten years, we have in these simple facts food for much wonder and amazement at what the future has in store for us with regard to population. Sociology has no more important question before it than to decide how to deal with the tremendous issues consequent upon such an enormously increasing population. Nitti rightly observes that it has become the personal interest-of every individual. Even in the Twenties, before there was anything like the present pressure of numbers, men looked into the question and were bewildered. Some later on, more zealous than wise, plunged into the matter, and, thinking that numbers were the cause of present wretchedness and misery, wished to stop the flow at the very fount, and urged mechanical preventions. Very sincere, no doubt, in their feelings, but wrong economically. They failed to observe that the state of things which they had to contend with was not entirely owing to an excess of population, but to a difficulty of providing food, or the means of obtaining it. Given sufficient food there need be no fear what amount of population there might be. Further thought upon the whole matter has convinced many of those Neo-Malthusians who were foremost in the van in those days that their foundations and premisses were false, yet new and enthusiastic adherents are arising every day who conscientiously believe that Neo-Malthusianism will bring about that Utopia which we all so eagerly desire. All sorts of theories can now be amply discussed, and it would be a disastrous policy to keep the treatment of Neo-Malthusianism hidden away. "One other threatening danger, Neo-Malthusianism, one almost universally passed over in silence, but which, I am certain, ought not longer to be ignored." The English people have suffered quite long enough from the folly of having kept back everything relating to what must be a disastrous course for them to adopt. Writing in *The Humanitarian* for November, 1896, Dr. S. A. K. Strahan says, "The question has, however, developed so remarkably of late that I think the time has come when all false shame and make-belief should be thrown aside, and the question and its effects be straightly put before the people. Women guilty of such offences against morality and nature as those we hint at can

hardly accuse us of debasing their minds; others need not peruse our lines." The latter portion of this quotation can equally well apply to what follows in this book.

Everything can be improved by light and knowledge, and this subject is certainly one of those which especially need the fullest consideration. "The prejudices against the discussion of Neo-Malthusianism are dying out, and that is well, for they do nothing but obscure appreciation of the merits or demerits of the doctrine." (*Evolution of Sex*.) It is quite evident that anything which tends to throw any light and information on the terrible problems of present-day poverty and social disorder ought to be heartily welcomed by every humane person. I am convinced that if what is now commonly known as Neo-Malthusianism had not been brought before the public by the Bradlaugh trial its consideration would have arisen later. The mistake of those who brought about that trial was that they caused the subject to arise before the proper time for its consideration became urgent, and so many minds were taken captive by what seemed a ready and easy remedy at hand.

Dealing with the matter so far as its history in England is concerned, Mrs. Besant's retraction of those earlier opinions of hers, which she held so strenuously, advocated so earnestly, and suffered for so much, is a noteworthy fact which will be referred to later on. At the time of the trials held as to the legality of publishing Neo-Malthusian literature, certain other individuals, in addition to Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant, were prosecuted for selling books on the subject. Truelove was fined fifty pounds and imprisoned for six months for selling a book which had been sold for many years previously without any interference. This was most unjust, and only increased the bitter spirit of those who were upholding what they thought philanthropic truth and right in boldly advocating Neo-Malthusian practice. The course of persecution they underwent recoiled on the heads of those who caused it by increasing the sale and circulation of these works, which rapidly increased in number. Large meetings were held in Manchester, Bradford, and elsewhere in similar large cities. Resolutions were carried by overwhelming majorities in assemblages of both sexes, declaring in favour of Neo-Malthusianism. These meetings were principally spoken to on the subject by Mrs. Besant. The interest taken in the

matter caused the rise of the Malthusian League, with Dr. C. R. Drysdale as its President.

It can now be seen how fatal a mistake was made in prosecuting the publishers of such works. They ought not to have been interfered with. Nothing but an increased publicity was gained. We are in justice bound to give both writers and publishers ample credit for having been actuated by the highest philanthropic motives. They were impelled, they say, to undertake the crusade, which was personally repugnant to their feelings, in consequence of the terrible evils attendant upon excess of population, overcrowding, competition, and poverty. They endeavoured, wisely as they thought, to introduce a system which would do away with them all. We may disagree as to their mode of action, but all right-minded people must give them credit for having acted with a good motive, mistaken as we believe them to have been. It cannot be wrong to write or publish anything which, in accordance with the rights of justice, might tend to alleviate human suffering. What we may complain of is that works such as these, dealing with, to say the least, very doubtful points of morality and economy, should have been recklessly distributed amongst an increasing multitude totally incompetent to form a judgment upon the points raised. That is what was done, and owing to the abortive issue of the prosecution, it now seems to be taken for granted by a very unworthy class of imitators that anything may with impunity be written and published with a view to advocate Neo-Malthusian practice, and so bring grist to the mills of those pecuniarily concerned.

Many are aware of the numbers of tracts and pamphlets advocating this system, which are sent to householders in every class of life. What numbers of advertisements appear in the newspapers! I have one before me now which contains no less than six such. If one of these advertisements be answered, there comes a pamphlet in reply telling of Neo-Malthusianism, and giving the price of the articles required; hence the profit. Not merely in these pamphlets, but in catalogues of articles sold in certain shops, these recommendations occur. Every one of them teaches the so-called advantages of a limited number of children, and plainly shows how sexual intercourse need not be followed by fertilization.

"One of those silly-season controversies, which have of late become so dear to the hearts of the big editors, has in the early autumn been going on in one of the leading London dailies. The subject is Early Marriages. As might be expected, many of the correspondents have been women, all with a certain modicum of education; and it is positively alarming, not to say disgusting, to note how these women speak of the voluntary limitation of the family. One, referring to her own case, says, 'We have one child, which we can bring up well; we dare not run the risk of any more.' Another, advising her married sisters, remarks: 'Keep your family well within your means.' And so they run on. The question is—What state of things does this indicate?" (Strahan.)

In maternity hospitals, *Scientific Meliorism* tells us, visiting ladies leave large quantities of these tracts, and we are told with marked success. "The women are so glad to receive them," "the instructions are so eagerly acted upon." I know of a good old squire in East Anglia who regularly distributes these tracts throughout his neighbourhood. We find them everywhere; in railway carriages, in public rooms, wherever publicity can be obtained.

Mrs. Besant tells us in her autobiography what a large number of letters she received from grateful women, amongst them clergymen's wives, for having been the means of bringing such valuable information to their knowledge and use. It has been acted upon. In that book, *A Christian with Two Wives*, by the Rev. Dennis Hurd, we find the following:—"The two girls are happy; they have three sons each, and they might have had ten, but I think three plenty for one woman; it just develops her nature and character, and makes her more lovely." Comment is needless.

This wide distribution of modern literature advocating Neo-Malthusianism has brought about a very serious condition of things. What was merely hinted at twenty years ago is now openly talked about as the most proper and useful course to adopt. Is it any wonder, then, that the birth-rate decreases? All classes seem to be smitten by the Neo-Malthusian craze, now rapidly spreading, fondly imagining that it will remove all human woes and totally eradicate poverty and wretchedness. The matter will soon have to be grappled with in a very vigorous way, for those who think at all must see that to voluntarily cause the population of a civilized country to

decline is of the most vital interest to everybody concerned. The nations of civilized countries need to be shown how utterly mistaken they are if they should persist in following the Neo-Malthusian practice. That it is immoral is not the least doubtful, and as regards the destruction of the prosperity of the nation that adopts it there can be no doubt whatever.

The earlier writers in England on the matter did not write for the sake of mere gain, they wrote with a philanthropic purpose in view; the modern writers do so merely to make a profit. "In later times our sense of decency has been shocked by the outspoken denunciation, not of marriage, but of its consequences, and the bold inculcation of means whereby the gratification of natural inclinations may be joined with the violation of nature's laws and the frustration of nature's ends." (Bourne.)

I cite the following testimony—I could a great deal more—just to show how the doctrines of Neo-Malthusianism are rapidly spreading in England. So long ago as the Manchester Church Congress of 1888, Professor Symes said, "I have the strongest reason to know that the subject is engaging the attention of an immense number of people of all classes in England and elsewhere." Another speaker at the same Congress said, "The awful heresy which is prevailing throughout the country as to restraining the growth of population by artificial means." What will be said now when the system is increasing by leaps and bounds?

At the present time a more modern school of thought on the same subject has arisen, but of a more refined expression. It is composed chiefly of women, who declare that the duties of maternity are becoming increasingly irksome to all classes of women, especially to the more highly educated, and that sexual intercourse and its result, maternity, are utterly repugnant to a proper woman's feelings. It is an entire revolt against what has hitherto been believed to be the moral duties of woman. Women who write upon this subject declare maternity to be a degradation to them, and they will refuse to undergo it in the future. We have arrived at this state of things in England. These aspects of the matter will be fully discussed in the course of the following pages. I merely mention them here to show how the earlier ideas of Neo-Malthusianism have grown into a condition of things which

will need the gravest consideration on all sides. Marriage, children, all sex relationships, are being terribly threatened in every country where Neo-Malthusianism is carried into practice. Such is a slight sketch of the origin and growth in England of the matter to which serious attention will be called in the following pages.

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM NOT THE TEACHING OF THE REV. T. R. MALTHUS (1766-1834)

THE nomenclature, Neo-Malthusianism, is an error. "What shall we say to men who have dared to call themselves Neo-Malthusians and then have indulged in immoral disquisitions on preventive intercourse?" (Cossa.) No authority whatever can be found in Malthus' writings for what is now known as Neo-Malthusianism, with all its artificial methods to destroy reproduction. "It is one of the many examples of the irony of fate to which he (Malthus) has been a victim that his name should be thus employed, for he expressly declared that a course which may prevent any particular evil may be beyond all comparison worse than the evil itself." (Price.) For instance, on the front page of *The Malthusian* there appears monthly this standard quotation from the writings of Malthus: "To a rational being the prudential check to population ought to be considered as equally natural with the check from poverty and premature mortality." Now it is quite evident to all who have, even no matter how superficially, read the writings of Malthus, that by prudential checks to population Malthus meant nothing more than moral sexual self-restraint, certainly not voluntarily causing a limit by married people to the number of their children; yet he is quoted here as apparently approving of the artificial check system which *The Malthusian* merely exists to support, teach, and advocate. The real fact is, as will be proved later, that Malthus utterly disapproved of anything immoral being done to prevent the conception of human life. I leave it to my readers to judge how far this course of conduct by Neo-Malthusians is fair to the memory of the Rev. T. R. Malthus. "It is beyond all doubt that the Neo-Malthusians are the children, not of Malthus, but of Owen." (Bonar). Those who ignorantly believe that Malthus ever wrote anything calculated to advocate artificial checks to population should do his memory the

simple justice of reading the Essay itself. "No man has ever suffered so much from being answered by those who have never seen his works." (Nicholson.) Let Malthus speak for himself on this matter. "I should be extremely sorry to say anything which could be either directly or remotely construed unfavourably to the cause of virtue. I should always particularly reprobate any artificial and unnatural modes of checking population, both on account of their immorality and their tendency to remove a necessary stimulus to industry. If it were possible for each married couple to limit by a wish the number of their children, there is certainly reason to fear that the indolence of the human race would be very greatly increased, and that neither the population of individual countries or of the whole world would ever reach its natural and proper extent." (Vol. iii. p. 393.)

I think the above extract ought to wholly convince the most zealous Neo-Malthusian that he is not a true disciple of the Rev. T. R. Malthus. It is altogether unjust to connect this modern movement to artificially control the number of one's children with his name. He never advocated such a doctrine. To foist upon him such a scheme is utterly unjustifiable. It may with just propriety be reckoned that if he were alive now he would be the first to repudiate it.

Professor Flint says that the so-called wise regulation of the birth-rate advocated in such books as *Scientific Procreation*—what the members of the Malthusian League mean by it—would lead to the most shocking demoralization of all classes. He truly observes, "Malthus would have disowned with horror the Malthusian League." Malthus was certainly correct in saying that if population should be lessened, a great stimulus to improvement in every direction would be removed. Nitti says: "The suppression of every kind of struggle, the elimination of every unsatisfied need, would bring about a fatal and irresistible cessation of development in society." There should necessarily be competition in all things—by such we gain improvement—but it ought to be a fair and just competition, not the frightful thing we see under that appellation now. The incentive to progress should be a just and righteous one. All economists tell us that if we remove the proper pressure of population on subsistence, necessity being the mother of invention, which causes the latter to increase, we are removing the spring of human industry, and the motive power of human

progress. They also bid us remember that a dense population is better able to take fuller advantage of inventions and organizations than countries which are thinly populated could, and that a full population can exchange its wealth which it creates for the means of subsistence from elsewhere. If the world had acted hitherto upon the Neo-Malthusian principle of diminishing population, what improvements would have been discovered? There would have been no stimulus to further knowledge, no necessity to improve which should always be allowed to act as the mother of manhood. A properly arranged population, not a recklessly increased one, should always exist as an incentive to progress, but not to cause the frightful tooth and claw competition which we have now upon us, with all its callousness to suffering. See "Over Population" in *Common-sense Socialism*. (Kempner.) Henry George says that an increase of population is often one of the most essential requisites for increasing the productiveness of industry. A large population is necessary for the proper division of employment, and also to carry out great works, and without a large population it is impossible to have such things as railways, large ships, and mills, to say nothing of the arts and literature. Yves Guyot says: "The increase of population forces progress on every people which has not, like the Hindoo, given itself up to passive resignation. Beneath this pressure the contest for existence becomes more eager, man makes greater efforts, he develops his powers and his capacities and abilities. If we cannot say that all densely populated nations are strong, we can at least say that the nation with a spare and stagnant population has ever been less strong."

Malthus wrote at a time when statesmen were endeavouring by means of the old Poor Law, that absurd and unjust system, to encourage an unwise course of increasing population. No doubt the object they had in view was to be enabled to keep up the supply for the army in its struggles against Napoleon, and this unrighteous course was pursued utterly regardless of all economic and social issues. "At a time when society was governed by real military rulers, and the power of the Sovereign had no other basis than military strength, the chief care of every State was that of having a large number of citizens fit for bearing arms, and hence of promoting in every way the increase of population. They only busied themselves with enlarging their dominions, or increasing the population,

in order to win prosperity and riches for their subjects by wars of conquest. *Tyrannicus et cynicus Gallie imperator dixit, ut una nox Lutetie Parisiorum ampla esset, ipsius exercitus vacuum complere.*" (Nitti.)

All Malthus' ideas and arguments, throughout his entire works, are largely influenced by this course of action on the part of those who then ruled Europe. Godwin, before him, had written of the Utopia and future economic welfare of the nation which was sure to come. Malthus, unable to foretell modern improvements, endeavoured to prove that such prosperity was merely a chimerical dream impossible of achievement; that population was increasing, and always would increase, on the powers of subsistence. He argued that population was always limited by want of food; that there could be only sufficient for a certain quantity; and that when population increased, want and misery must inevitably follow suit.

The fact that food might be made to accompany population in due proportion never seems to have entered Malthus' brain; he seems incapable of entertaining that idea. "Malthus' law is incapable of explaining the mystery of poverty." (Nitti.) Max Nordau very aptly remarks that it never entered the heads of Malthus and his disciples to state their principles in a reversed form.

The provisions produced by the earth are not sufficient to support her children, therefore we must increase the amount of provisions. The same remark exactly applies to the Neo-Malthusian of to-day, with the proviso thrown in of a just distribution of the earth's productions. "Malthus and his followers, while bringing prominently forward the increasing needs of a population, keep out of view the increasing means of supply which the additional labour of greater numbers will produce." (Minton.)

Owing to those circumstances, both social and economic, which existed in the time of Malthus, men's minds naturally assumed a pessimistic mode of thought. Malthus, and many others of his day, never imagined that there could be any way out of the slough of despond in which the worker was then adrift. Hence, everything which deals with population is known as "The dismal science." He quite ignored and underrated the help which economic progress might bring in its train. He erred through ignorance. It was impossible

for him to have gauged the marvellous improvement in the production of food which was to come, nor the vast annihilation of distance which steam was to bring about. We have the whole world now as a granary to gather in our food from. This is one of the resources of an advanced civilization which Malthus could not be expected to have foreseen, and which largely diminishes the whole force of his arguments.

There is no civilized country in the world now which remains dependent on its local resources for its food. England is a very pertinent example of this. Lord George-Hamilton remarked the other day, speaking of the famine then threatening parts of India, that the difficulty in coping with it would be much lessened by the fact that we could draw upon the whole world for food, and that this was the first famine for which it could be done.

"Malthus wrote especially for his own time, and he generalized perhaps unduly from the facts which he was himself witnessing." But he was by no means the first writer in Europe who had been led to consider the population question, which was even then drawing attention to itself. In England, Swift and Adam Smith; in Italy, Beccaria and the friar Ortes. Malthus, I think, must have become acquainted with some of this friar's writings; the arguments here and there seem identical. Ortes, the Venetian friar, published his work in 1790; Malthus his in 1798. "Some pages of Ortes seem quite similar to those of Malthus. There is even a great affinity in the remedies proposed by the Catholic friar and the Anglican priest." (Nitti.)

Malthus' Essay was received with delight by the wealthy Tories of his time, who could now look upon the forlorn, poverty-stricken condition of the labouring population and say it was brought about by too early marriages, or even by marrying at all. "Malthus' hypothesis is belied by a century of research. His theory was a spontaneous product of an alarming and dangerous state of things; it was only a passing phenomenon, but it assumed a permanent and enduring character in the eyes of the English economists. By preaching moral restraint and the adoption of preventive measures, they ended with creating and authorizing the immoral movement of the so-called Neo-Malthusians." (Nitti.)

Marx goes too far when he describes Malthus' work as "a scholastic, superficial, and priestly plagiarism from Sir James

Stewart, Townsend, Franklin and Wallace." Malthus' whole argument may be summed up somewhat like this:—The troubles consequent upon what is to be considered over-population, must always arise from an excess of human beings, not from a deficiency of food. For instance, he wrote that famines were natural means for removing an excess of population which had arisen. Now of course we know that these can only arise from bad distribution and communication. If the supply of food had been keeping pace with the increase of population, and if it had been fairly distributed, or the means of acquiring it had been within the power of all, the Essay would not have been written. Malthus ransacked the world's barbaric populations, among whom famines and wars were chronic, for arguments upon which to build his case.

The whole economic thought of his time was that population would overwhelm the means of subsistence, and would always increase faster than the latter could. We have now learned something better than this; we now believe that if subsistence is lacking for population, it is mostly owing to faulty social and economic laws, such as an unequal and unjust distribution of wealth, a lack of judicious emigration, a proper system of education, good marriage laws, a reformed mode of farming, tenure of land, and temperance. Malthus used his best efforts to prove that population ought not to be artificially encouraged; that was the urgent question which needed dealing with in his day. The lapse of time has vitiated all the force of his argument, but it was of great force in his days, and its power has not altogether yet faded away. Nitti rightly speaks of his work as follows:—"Even when Malthus' Essay shall have altogether failed, and the current of the new ideas and the new researches shall have buried it, and time, which, as Anacreon says, conquers everything, shall have consumed it, it will still appear a wonderful monument of insight and acumen." Since his time the powers of increasing the means of subsistence for our population have increased to an extraordinary degree, much more than the population has increased, and these powers of supplying food have resulted in an extraordinary increased output from every quarter of the earth. Space and time hardly exist now, so far as food is concerned.

All this Malthus could not have even conjectured. It is an undoubted fact that population always follows an

increase of the means of subsistence. It must be obvious to anybody who thinks at all, that the greater the wealth of a country, the greater can be the number of its population, and that poverty would be much diminished if that wealth was equally divided in just proportion. Another great help would accrue if the capitalist ceased to hoard wealth beyond that which he might legitimately need, and spend it instead upon increasing work.

The production of human beings may be looked upon as the means of forming an equilibrium between numbers and food. The great and complex question of population must always be chiefly considered from the standpoint of wealth, with which it is strictly bound up. Any civilized country, in which a perfect system of production and distribution prevailed, could support any reasonable amount of population. "The increase of population, so far from being regarded as a calamity, is in reality one of the factors of progress. Modern statistics silence Malthus with crushing force, while they justify the laws of divine wisdom and mercy. They bring forward incontrovertible evidence that a large community, other things being equal, is capable of producing more wealth, man for man, than is possible in a small community. They lead us to expect, as populations grow and become more organized in the future, that the energies of the masses will be taxed in a constantly lessening degree for the provision of the necessities of existence, and that leisure will be greater, and the comforts and refinements of life more easily obtainable. As for mere food, abundance is already secured to the Western civilization, while a mere tithe of the energy of the population is devoted to its production. No doubt it is the existing unequal distribution of wealth that hides these facts from general view. Abuses are notoriously long-lived, and error dies hard. After nearly a century of pernicious life in England, Malthus' decree, so fondly cherished by the affluent, is bound to wane under the light of modern statistics." (Minton.)

And Laing, in *Problems of the Future*, writes:—"We can afford to dismiss Malthus and his theory to a remote future, and look on it as a bogey no more affecting practical action than the prospect of the world coming to an end by the dissipation in space of solar heat."

Nitti says:—"As our century has been free from the wars, pestilences, and famines which have afflicted other ages,

population has increased as it never did before, and nevertheless the production of the means of subsistence has far exceeded the increase of men. Statistical study shows us that in every civilized country of modern Europe, even in the periods of disordered birth-rate which have characterized the nineteenth century, the means of subsistence has always exceeded the population, and that the unproductive consumption on the one side and pauperism on the other, increasing with fatal progress, are nothing else but a necessary consequence of the vitiated form of the distribution of wealth, and not of the excessive increase or fecundity of the human species. The countries where perfection of statistical material and the abundance of research have made the comparison easiest and most certain, have given the Neo-Malthusians the most complete and severe falsification."

If the Neo-Malthusian be convicted of falsely assuming the name and arguments of Malthus, of which there can be no dispute, and that these arguments themselves have completely lost their power under an improved condition of things, it is hard to see on what basis the whole edifice of Neo-Malthusianism can stand. That population can increase faster than subsistence may be conceded ; but, as a fact, it has never done so, except in barbaric countries where there was no proper organization, and where production and distribution were, or are, notoriously imperfect. "We may regard a redundant population not as a hopeless evil over which we must almost despair, not as the necessary effect of physical forces we cannot control, but as a symptom of some social disorder which it is our duty to investigate, and if possible to remedy." (Cunningham.)

The best criticism of Malthus and his work, compared with modern political economy, can be found in Chapter 1 of Minton's *Capital and Wages*, and also in his *Welfare of the Millions* (Chapter 2), both of which works may be read with much profit by those who desire to study this great question of population.

The wrong Poor Law system which was in force in Malthus' time, and which, no doubt, played a considerable part in prompting him to publish his work, encouraged population by relieving the working-classes of the due responsibility of maintaining themselves and their families. His precept against this course of action, which tended to minimize self-reliance,

was not to marry until there might be a fair prospect of supporting a family.

Toynbee pointed out that under the Poor Law Act which was then in force, cases had occurred in which mothers had threatened to turn their children out of doors unless they received capitation grants for their support. In the year 1806 an Act was passed exempting fathers of two children and upwards from all taxes. That Poor Law system quite discouraged any foresight, self-control, self-reliance, and the rightful spirit of independence. It completely demoralized the working-classes. The great aim of its opponents was to emphasize the duty of self-support, and the proper responsibilities of marriage and parentage. But, as the Rev. A. Lyttelton remarks in *The Economic Review*, this latter is not the object desired by the Neo-Malthusians; on the contrary, they work for a system which would entirely eradicate all these desirable virtues in the individual. Malthus never intended to convey the erroneous idea which the Neo-Malthusian school aims at, namely, that a thin population is preferable to a large one. With him, as it must be always, the population question must be the relationship of food to numbers. He failed to notice in his abstruse calculations, in consequence of his Tory belief, the artificial barriers which had been put up between the people and the food or the means of obtaining the food. Bastiat describes them fully in *Harmonies of Political Economy*. This is just the weak point also of the Neo-Malthusian arguments. The fact is that in Malthus' time the condition of the labourers was piteous in the extreme. Starvation and misery always stared them in the face. The peasant tradition concerning this state of things is very much alive even now, and Malthus, whom we know had very sensitive feelings, was very much impressed by it. All the wealth of that time was in the hands of the landlords, and the labourers, the sons of the soil, had no part nor lot in the land, and very little in the distribution of the wealth which came out of it. It seemed impossible to believe that their miserable condition could ever be alleviated, but on the contrary, it had every appearance of becoming worse and worse. He prophesied that it could only have that ending; hence arose his thoughts and his school. He considered it to be a law of nature itself that population should always outrun its means of subsistence. The absorbing question of his time was this—Is

this fear and terror of want of food to last for ever? Godwin and Condorcet said no. They were optimists. Malthus said yes. He was a pessimist. He attributed all the economic troubles of the labourer of his time to the latter's sexual indulgence, and not to a vitiated distribution.

"Having thus raised up in imagination a spectre of darkness and despair to brood over the human race, the actual existence of the ghost was assumed as a matter of course. Modern statistics flatly contradict the theory of Malthus as to the greater power of the increase of population over any possible power of the increase of subsistence." (Minton.)

France, about which I shall have a good deal to say later on, is a standing proof. Mr. Lyttelton also says that want is not caused by too great a population, but by a bad government and a vicious land system, for when both of these were removed, between 1790 and 1815, population and subsistence increased side by side at once.

When Malthus' whole theory is examined by the light of history and later knowledge, we can easily see that his premisses were unsound. "He was not ashamed to ground his entire system upon a very weak and uncertain foundation of statistical proofs." (Ingram.) For instance, he stated that population doubles itself in twenty-five years. If it really increased with the mathematical precision which he took for granted it did, no doubt it would, but history proves that it does nothing of the kind, not even in a hundred years, nor anything like it. Nitti fairly brings his arguments on the geometrical increase of population to a very crucial proof. In Malthus' time the population of Europe amounted to about 176,000,000, and Nitti proceeds to argue as follows:—

In 1800	176,000,000
„ 1700	88,000,000
„ 1600	44,000,000
„ 1500	22,000,000
„ 1400	11,000,000
„ 1300	5,500,000
„ 1200	2,750,000
„ 1100	1,375,000
„ 1000	687,500

According to this just estimate, he naturally asks what was the population of Europe in the time of Christ? If population doubles in a hundred years, Malthus ought to have found in Europe in his time 1400 milliards of human beings. Man has existed on the earth, at the lowest estimate, for 100,000 years. If population increased as Malthus thought it did, what ought the population of the world to be now? The fundamental error of Malthus was that he confounded real with potential increase. We who live now can easily see that Europe has in no way experienced the rapid increase of population which Malthus feared. There is certainly a possibility for population to double itself in twenty-five years, and to increase to an almost incredible extent, but there are continually forces from all sides contending against it, so that the actual increase over the possible one is very, very far less. For instance, one in every seven marriages is infertile. If population is increasing in one part of the world it, generally speaking, is declining in another. Such seems to be the case throughout all the historical period. Some who have gone into this question of population very deeply, like Botero, Sismondi, Buffon, Damilaville, Levasseur, Thornton, Alison, and other foreign and English writers on population, declare that the total population of the world does not vary much at any period. The teeming populations of Nineveh, Babylon, and Egypt, seem to have come further west. Their former habitations are denuded of human life. Other countries have taken it up. "The fact is that birth-rate and population are subject to laws which were quite unknown in the days of Malthus." (See Ogilvie in *Westminster Review*, September, 1891.) Sidgwick says that if all checks to the increase of population were removed, and that all married as they pleased, population would double itself in something under thirty years.

But manifold checks of all sorts are continually warring against its increase. Certainly for the present, anyhow, they are victorious. What will happen in time to come, owing to the sacredness of human life being more considered than it is now, and diseases being more overcome, is another matter. In Cæsar's time the population of England was about 700,000; in the time of the Heptarchy somewhat smaller. In the time of Henry V. it amounted to 2,500,000. In fifteen centuries therefore it had hardly tripled. Chalmers estimated the

population of England and Wales to have amounted in the year 1377 to 2,000,000.

After Malthus' death his name and influence were played fast and loose with, and all sorts of theories were attributed to him, some of which he never wrote of nor sanctioned in any way. It remained for our own day to see him falsely held up as a teacher of mischievous immorality. "Malthus, being a Christian, did not go so far as to recommend those immoral practices to which the great body of his followers had recourse later. The theory of moral restraint became quite contrary to what Malthus might have himself supposed—a real school of degradation." "The immoral counsels and practices propagated later among the elevated class of his followers." "Neo-Malthusianism is not Malthusian. It is neither more nor less than a brutal affirmation of individual egoism." "The moral aberrations into which the Neo-Malthusians have fallen." (Nitti.)

Those who wish to study what German and Italian writers on this subject of population think of the unjust connection made between Malthus' opinions and the modern craze of Neo-Malthusianism can do so in Oettingen's and Vanni's works, which treat largely of the immoralities and disadvantages both from the economic and social points of view of Neo-Malthusianism. Unfortunately they have not been translated into English, and are rare in this country. It can be gathered from what has been written that the moral restraint, resulting in postponement of marriage, which was what Malthus urged as a remedy in his day, is a very different thing to the artificial system which the Neo-Malthusians urge upon us. The arguments on its behalf are supposed to be founded upon the writings of Malthus, with what truth we have seen.

The artificial system is falsely derived from what is generally known as Malthusian doctrine, and although at first sight it might seem to be beneficial, when we come to consider the whole matter carefully we can easily see that it cannot afford anything for the alleviation of misery and want. On the contrary, it would be just as likely as not to increase them. A very low birth-rate, such as we now see in France, is an evil, because it must inevitably lead to future low production and productive power. To increase both of these is the truest economic science.

The philanthropical aspect of the matter is to see that those who produce the wealth have their just share, which is not the case now. To this the Neo-Malthusian should direct his social efforts, not to diminish productive power with its sure and certain results, namely, increased wealth.

"Given the constitution of modern society, the economic situation does not depend upon the increase of population, but, on the contrary, not only the number of those who live, but even the number of those who are born, depends upon the economic situation." (Nitti.)

A low birth-rate must also inevitably mean immorality of some sort or another, and the destruction of family life. But, on the other hand, a high birth-rate is an evil if the economic and social laws are unjust. As long as these are so the productive power is overwhelmed, and a condition of hopeless and helpless poverty ensues. Would that the Neo-Malthusian could see that his well-meant scheme only deals with the symptoms, not the causes; remove the causes which do injury to population, and no matter how large it may be, it might increase *ad libitum* without harm to anybody.

"Excess of population can never be excess of men, but deficiency of food." This is aptly put, and is a sound and true maxim. No matter how large a population may be, if there should be a sufficient supply of food all would be well: if any suffered, it would only be the idle and vicious. It is quite correct to say that competition is necessary to increase the output of food; it affords a healthy stimulus. But what we justly complain of now is, that present competition has broken all bounds. Under such an untoward and mischievous state of economics, the whole question of population requires the most serious consideration, and much more self-restraint is necessary than there would be under a different state of affairs.

The Neo-Malthusian differs from Malthus very materially in this most vital point. The former teaches, which Malthus did not, prudence without chastity; the latter is very careful to indicate what he means by moral restraint. He defines it as a self-denial from marriage, for prudential motives, by those who unfortunately lacked what might be considered sufficient means, with a conduct strictly moral during the period of this self-restraint, which is what every moral writer would approve of.

"The Malthusian theory still has its advocates ; but we imagine they are few in number. The theory has been effectually smashed by political economists of the heaviest metal, and we fondly thought that it was dead, but it appears not. But whatever there was to be said in favour of this theory from the standpoint of the economist or sociologist—and, to give its originator his due, he never advocated the limitation of the family from any other standpoint—there is absolutely nothing to be said in its favour as at present practised. The good of the State or of society does not enter into the question at all in the present day. The whole thing has its root and origin in pure and unadulterated selfishness, in undenying self-gratification, and so never comes within the purview of either economist or sociologist." (Strahan.)

Not the very slightest authority can be found in Malthus' writings to justify the immoral practice of Neo-Malthusianism. People have rashly put constructions upon his writings which they certainly cannot bear. Moreover, the general tenour of his writings is against their ideas. He always declared that a pressure of population stimulated improvement in everything. "Evil exists, not to create despair, but activity. An increase of population is both a great positive good and absolutely necessary to a further increase in the annual produce of the land and labour of any country. It is an utter misconception of my argument to infer that I am an enemy to population ; I am only an enemy to vice and misery." All he affirmed, in reality, was that regulation and direction were necessary for population, certainly not diminution or extinction.

Long before him Aristotle had taught that man always needed a stimulus to exertion. This must be allowed by all reformers. Whateley, with his usual sound sense, summed up Malthus' work as follows:—"Malthus has been sometimes represented as impugning Providence, and teaching that it has either made man too prolific, or the earth too barren. To me it has always appeared that the only sense in which he has done so is that in which one might be said to teach that Providence has made a certain river too wide and too deep, by pointing out that one who cannot swim should not attempt to cross it without a boat. And if anyone should warn men that the juice of the grape has a tendency to produce intoxication, and should caution them accordingly to avoid

intemperance, he would not be understood as finding fault with Providence for making vines too prolific. Malthus all along represents Providence as having endowed man with reason, and requiring that we should make use of it to avoid many dangers which would otherwise beset us. If men will act irrationally, they are liable to be drowned in attempting to ford a river no less than to incur such evils as Malthus points out." Of course, under his system there might naturally follow the conclusion that the rich were to marry whenever they pleased, but that the poor were not to marry at all, yet if they did, were to postpone it until middle age. In other words, marriage was to be a privilege for the wealthy classes only.

The problem of population is a very complex and difficult one, no matter from what side we approach it, but Malthus' idea that it was to be kept within bounds by refusing marriage to the worker was so unjust that it had its own elements of failure within it, for the class to which he, with his Tory inclinations, addressed himself was one which never would nor could listen to nor give any heed to his pessimistic advice. He studied the question of marriage, although himself of a gentle nature, from a cynical and misanthropical point of view. Calvinism was of great force in his time, and he never seems to have been able to shake off the melancholy aspect which it gives to everything, especially to the great increase of population which had then begun to take place. He looked upon the problem as a theorist; he does not seem to have probed into what the minds of those for whom he wrote were thinking of on the whole matter. He warred against the most powerful incentive in human nature, love; and he failed—which will always be the case of those who ignore it. A course of action infused into human beings by nature and nature's God cannot be fought against successfully. "While philosophers are disputing about the government of the world, hunger and love are performing the task." (Schiller.)

Neo-Malthusianism has entirely arisen from the necessity of dealing in some way with the increasing numbers of our population, and so it is to the very last degree worthy of our most serious consideration. Nothing can be of more importance to our national and social life than this system; it touches the very foundations of all society. There cannot be a

greater subject of importance to any State than that of an increasing or decreasing number of its inhabitants.

Population is the mystery of all mysteries as yet insoluble. It is the foundation of all economic and philanthropic science; all the intricate questions of the world's weal or woe have their origin in population. Nitti says the question is vast and terrible as the Egyptian sphinx, and whoever wishes to study the mystery underlying the whole history of mankind must question it acutely. Messedaglia says, "It is the most momentous and difficult economic problem, always of present importance." Rossi says it is the problem which concerns everything, morals and politics, national and domestic economy.

It is no wonder, then, that some eager and enthusiastic spirits amongst us, urged on by their sympathy for the sufferings of the poor, have energetically taken up this modern craze of Neo-Malthusianism, sincerely believing that by artificially restricting the number of children they are benefiting both the individual and the nation. But it must be borne in mind that there are two classes of Neo-Malthusians: one acting undoubtedly from a philanthropic standard, the other merely wishing to give itself up to hedonism and so do away with all chastity, anxious and ready to throw off all self-restraint, and plunge into such a condition of licentiousness as the world has never witnessed hitherto. They desire to indulge themselves freely in sexual passion, while at the same time repudiating and evading all duty to and responsibility for child life, which is the lawful object for which that natural passion was ordained. It does not require much penetration, except for those who wilfully close their eyes, to see what disastrous effects the practice of Neo-Malthusianism would most assuredly have on the nation and individual, and which Malthus, its supposed founder, clearly foresaw and strongly condemned. We shall, in the course of this volume, consider what those effects would inevitably be.

THE ARGUMENT OF THE NEO-MALTHUSIANS

THEY describe with great force, honesty, and ability, the horrors which are always attendant upon an excess of population over subsistence, and the frightful fratricidal competition for food which must of necessity ensue, and which has been so graphically described in the numberless publications dealing with the matter. See *Problems of Poverty* for instance. The sorrows, miseries, privations and diseases of the half-starved, ill-clad sufferers, all of which they say are the results of over-population.

That married women, instead of staying at home regulating the moral and physical formation of their children, are obliged to seek their own and children's food in competition with men, and that that is destructive to the future physical powers of our race. The husband is unable through competition to earn sufficient to maintain a family, hence the wife is called in to help, she who ought to be at home. Then feminine labour brings down the labour market, which is always guided by the lowest price accepted. The capitalist is always seeking the cheapest labour. The best writers of the day unhesitatingly condemn this unnecessary burthen being placed on married women, which can only result in a weakened race. A rightly ordered community offers protection and health to women. Man's part in the life of the species is that of the bread-winner; woman's part is that of the preserver and defender of the living generation; she is the improver of the race by natural selection, as she excites strife between the men of whom she is the prize, and in which the ablest competitor secures the most valuable prizes.

All this, the Neo-Malthusian declares, is, owing to disastrous and unequal competition, quite out of the question. Women are weakened, deteriorated by overwork, which ought not to be their lot, aged before their time, their children neglected; their case is desperate.

The Neo-Malthusians also say that owing to the terrible and merciless competition which now prevails, caused by a too redundant population, hopeless, helpless, starving girls are obliged to prostitute themselves to earn their food or help a stricken family. They are most reluctantly, by stress of circumstances, forced into a life which Duchatelet described as worse than death, and which Lecky described as "the most mournful, and in some respects the most awful, upon which the eye of the moralist can dwell. That unhappy being whose name is a shame to speak of, who is scorned and insulted as the vilest of the sex, and doomed for the most part to disease and wretchedness; that degraded and ignoble form remains, while creeds and civilization rise and fall, the eternal priestess of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people." When Lecky wrote *European Morals* he estimated that the number of prostitutes in England amounted to 50,000; we shall see what the present numbers amount to later on. The awful fact remains for morality to consider that these poor creatures increase as so-called civilization advances. (For a graphic description of the prostitute's life, see *Merrie England*, p. 112.) Owing to the struggle for food now, it is observed that younger girls than formerly was the case, mere children, have taken to immoral lives, driven thereto, not of their own free will, far from it, but for the sake of food—sometimes, alas, initiated into the life by those whose natural duty ought to be to shield them from it. The struggle for life and food has now become so keen that the earnings of the daughter's dishonour are considered quite as natural as those earned in other ways!

It must be borne in mind that prostitution for the sake of a livelihood was utterly unknown amongst all savage races until white men introduced it. It is not a relic of primitive man; it entered into being with what we wrongly term in many respects civilization, which in other words often means a complex struggle for life. (See Wake's *Development of Marriage* and Westermarck's *History of Marriage*; also Letourneau's *Evolution of Morality* and his *Evolution of Marriage*.)

The Neo-Malthusians declare that, owing to the dreadful competition for life now taking place, prostitution has enormously increased of late, and that this, as well as all the other untold miseries of the poor, arise from excessive population struggling within itself.

They say that the unemployed are caused by it, that

miserable class, always tramping in search of work and finding it not. That the whole matter requires alleviation, and that if something is not done to relieve the present congestion of population, the consequences will be frightful, and a cataclysm imminent. They enlarge upon all the manifold arguments which misery and want can too abundantly supply. Compare all these throes of human misery, they say, hundreds of thousands always in a chronic condition of semi-starvation, vast numbers living on bread and tea only; large numbers of children by day and by night crying for food; compare all this piteous misery with our system, which would remove all of them—our glorious system, which we from pure, simple feelings of humanity and sympathy advise you to freely adopt. Take no thought for the morrow; marry whenever you please, no matter at how youthful an age; put aside all fear of "encumbrances"; have but one child, or, better still, none at all. Unhesitatingly gratify all sexual passion; eat, drink and be merry; children are a nuisance—free yourselves from them. Let not the anxiety for the support of a family enter into your consideration for a moment. They fully descant upon the dreadful vices which must always be likely to ensue from any system of deferred marriage, the disease, the crime, the suicide, and the fact that the rate of mortality amongst unmarried men at twenty-five is equal to that of the married at forty-five.

They also cite as a fact that large numbers of both sexes are forced to deny themselves marriage, which all must admit is a most humanising force, yet they are obliged to see the wealthy classes able to gratify themselves in this respect whenever they please, and that this is not just.

"As things stand to-day, we prevent an immense number of our finest potential mothers from realizing their own natures, and this artificial restriction is galling and irksome to them. How are we to free the important work of child-bearing from its existing slavery to mere monetary considerations? To me it seems that England to-day is full of celibate women, to whom their condition is, rightly and naturally, a wrong and a grievance. Our girls are crying, not for freedom to be nuns, but for freedom to be mothers." (Grant Allen.) This state of things will, of course, continue as long as the present vitiated system of distribution lasts.

They say that in consequence of the natural fear prevalent amongst the professional classes of being unable to provide

for or maintain a family, the marriage age is being continually postponed, with terrible effect upon the health of the nation and the vigour of the children. That in consequence of this untoward state of things, venereal disease is rapidly gaining ground amongst all classes. They say that marriage, God's ordinance against sexual vice, can now be only attained by the rich. That human nature, constituted as it is, with sexual instinct so strong and yet so natural, is not to be, and should not be, repressed.

The following is a very good illustration of their advice:—"What I would propose is simply that steps should be taken (such as giving proper support to the Malthusian League) to bring to the knowledge of the poor those innocent and inexpensive means of enabling married people to avoid the burden of children they do not want, which have been for years in use in the homes of some of the rich and middle classes. It is only want of public sympathy and support that prevents the Malthusian League going among the poor and showing them how they can, at a cost of less than one half-penny per week, and without any inconvenience, marry without any fear of having more children than they can bring up in decency and comfort." I merely quote this from Mr. Dunton's article on "Marriage in East London" in the *Free Review*, just to show how openly people write on the matter.

They declare that multitudes of both sexes cannot put their lawful and natural powers into proper use, but are driven to vice. That the loves of wife, husband and children can never be obtained by many who crave for them. That the maternal instinct of women, so strong, so good, cannot lawfully be gratified for fear of adding to an already existing overplus of population, and so increasing their own and their children's misery. That the physical condition of an unmarried woman at forty is far inferior to a married woman at that age.

And so deep down in the hearts of the professional classes, not the working labourer one, for that marries regardless of all issues, there is a vast, growing sense of rebellion against all this unnatural inequality of just rights, and that the consequences of an enforced celibacy will be very awful.

It cannot be expected, says the Neo-Malthusian, that these classes will or can practise entire continence, and so, marriage being feared on account of the children, the moral condition of England is being rapidly destroyed. All these adverse

conditions to marriage are clean contrary to religion, to nature, to moral order and justice. That this impossibility of having recourse to marriage, consequent upon the present state of overpopulation, is producing a deep sense of discontent and hatred of the moneyed classes. Within all hearts, it is said, there is a deep feeling against this cruel hindrance to marriage, and it is rapidly becoming too great a burden to be borne. Marriage is honourable in all men, but far too few are able to obtain it. That in itself sexual instinct is not impure; all that it properly needs is a lawful, just and moral exercise, which it cannot be gainsaid for a single moment is not now to be obtained under the present unjust social system.

The Neo-Malthusians unhesitatingly affirm that their system would remove all hindrances to marriage, and would, moreover, cure all our social troubles. They point with delight to the wonderful increase of its practice, which proves that they have supplied a want, and that a still further and gigantic increase is looming in the immediate future. They declare that it is a cruel and a hard lot "to force upon others what is now forced upon them, viz., 'to resist and forego, habitually and generally, sometimes altogether, always during the most craving period of life, those imperious longings of the heart, which, combined, constitute the most urgent necessity of our nature, and which the Creator must have made thus urgent for wise and righteous purposes.'" (Greg.)

The Neo-Malthusian, to support his arguments and ideas, quotes Brodie's statement at the Birmingham Science Congress:—"The evils of celibacy quite equal those of prostitution." And again, Holmes Coote's remarks in *The Lancet*, July 14th, 1889:—"The evils connected with continence are productive of far greater misery to society than incontinence."

The statement is freely made that in consequence of marriage being out of the question for very many, a certain form of abominable vice is becoming to be adopted far more than it used to be. This, whatever may be the cause, is, I believe, correct in the main. It is also declared that postponement of marriage until the physical powers are failing will inevitably bring about a serious deterioration of the race. This the Neo-Malthusians declare is actually taking place before our eyes. That the universal practice of Neo-Malthusianism would remove all these adverse influences so detrimental to social welfare and human happiness. That their system would

reduce crime very much, for it is notorious that the married are much steadier than the unmarried. That in every community where we find the most married, there we also, without question, find the most order and regularity of life. That in the Arcadia which they are certain this system would produce, the tired wanderer would no longer ever be seeking for work, which he findeth not, but work would be eagerly seeking for men. That a thin population is far preferable to an overabundant one, for in it all would have enough, even plenty. That education, or as they term it "brain sharpening," is only another means whereby some can conquer and overwhelm others in the struggle to live. That all charity, thrift, help of any sort, are utterly useless under present conditions of industrial life; the evil must be strangled in its very source; population must be lessened if human woes and sufferings are to cease. That the silly gabble about promoting thrift is merely encouraging people to be misers, and upholding the sin of selfishness, causing them to extinguish their sympathy for their fellow-creatures lying in piteous destitution. That anything done to relieve present misery, as long as population is allowed to recklessly increase as it is doing now, is but labour lost and charity misplaced. The only efficacious cure is to limit the number of one's children, and then the new era of prosperity, so long prayed for, will come to pass.

Such is a slight sketch of the Neo-Malthusian argument, which is most vigorously upheld at public meetings open to both sexes, and by an increasing and powerful literature scattered broadcast all over the kingdom before an unreasoning and ignorant people.

What have we, who oppose their system, to say in reply? Well, we can say to the Neo-Malthusian we fully and sorrowfully admit that all you tell us of our miserable social inequalities and injustice is, alas, only too true, and they need quick, sure, and certain remedies; but we utterly deny that what you advise to be done would relieve them in the very least. They could exist just as well in the thinnest as well as in the thickest population. The schemes which you Neo-Malthusians hold forward as rightly calculated to put an end to all human misery are fallacious from beginning to end. The fact is that the Neo-Malthusian starts from wrong premisses altogether; he deals with the mere fringe of the problem; he makes poverty dependent simply upon an excess

of population instead of upon unequal distribution, incomplete production, and an unnatural social system, unjust and merciless to the last degree. No matter how small a population might be, it will certainly suffer from poverty if it is not allowed to share equally in general production, and if it is denied free access to the land, the source of all wealth and food. The most terrible poverty can exist in a thin population, and in which there was ample subsistence. See the present condition of Morocco, for instance. There is a splendid object-lesson on this point close beside us. A most beautiful fertile country, its soil the most productive in the world, capable of producing anything, lies barren and waste; the people are generally in a state of chronic want and misery, yet the population is very small. Its area is 314,000 square miles, with an estimated population of only four millions. The area of Ireland is but 31,759 square miles, yet it supports a population of five millions. Morocco, that country rich in everything, lies stagnant with a thin population in hunger and need, in consequence of misgovernment.

Wherever there exist difficulties in bringing population to food, or *vice versâ*, there will unquestionably also exist chronic want and all kinds of miseries. (See Cairnes.) In barbaric countries we see these difficulties rampant, for the simple reason that ignorance is rampant also, but in civilized countries they are gradually being removed. Still grave blots on our Christianity, mercy, and justice remain; until these are lessened and removed the cries of the wretched will be heard in the land.

There is a great deal of truth in some of the statements which the Neo-Malthusian brings forward with regard to marriage, the hindrances to it, and its enforced postponement. Major Seton Churchill says:—"Considering the very high position given in the Bible to marriage, it is an appalling thought that there is a constantly increasing number of unmarried men and women growing up together far beyond the age when people ought to marry. Such is the artificial state of society we have reached in the 19th century that marriage, one of the necessary institutions of life, is becoming more and more an expensive luxury in which only a comparative few can indulge. It is a thing to which public opinion must be directed, and on which all right-minded men and women should speak out plainly. It is palpably absurd to condemn the evils of immorality, on the one hand, and yet seek to

ignore a cause which, perhaps more than any other, leads to it. If society forces men and women, through untoward circumstances, to live an abnormal existence, some frightful penalty will be demanded. Indeed, the penalty is already being paid in the growing immorality of our large towns and cities, and the plain decadence of morality amongst the boys of the upper classes. Unless something is done to meet the evil, it will grow to an appalling magnitude, of which we have now, looking at it in its incipient stage only, absolutely no conception."

Major Churchill's indictment against modern society, with regard to its position towards marriage, is very terrible, but it is perfectly true. Surely it is obviously every right-minded person's duty to work for a nobler, more moral, purer, and more just condition between the sexes, to remove all improper and unjustifiable impediments in the way of healthy and pure marriage. Neo-Malthusianism would not assuredly help us in this respect in the very least. We should only be putting other grave evils into the places of those we removed, viz., the wholesale decay of national power, and personal physical weakness. The key of the whole situation is economic reform: that which is urged upon the nation by all thoughtful writers. There are plenty of books treating of the matter now being issued. (See *Capital and Wages*, *Problems of Poverty*, etc.) We want social reform, we want more Christian feeling the one towards the other. Everybody, except those whose hearts have turned into stone, must have compassion on and feel pity for those of our flesh and blood who, through no fault of their own, are compelled to labour under hard and iniquitous conditions from the cradle to the grave. Dreary, unhappy lives, always torn with anxiety for daily bread, always toiling for wealth, but of which they are not permitted to obtain their just and lawful share. On the contrary, the chief part of it passes into the coffers of the capitalist, the non-worker, the idle, and the vicious. The producer is forbidden to touch but a mite of that which the sweat of his brow has accumulated.

Every man's hand, in the struggle to obtain even a share of this scanty pittance, is directed against his neighbour with a view to crush him out, lest he should acquire a part of it. This is the exact opposite of every humane and Christian principle. Competition says hate and destroy your fellow-

creature. Christ says love and aid him. Competition says use every means to deceive. Christ says be true and just in all your dealings. Competition brings about such a state of things as this. Common shirts are sold at ten shillings and sixpence per dozen, and the woman who makes them earns only two shillings and a penny half-penny per dozen.

"This great problem of poverty in the midst of wealth, and observe it is a poverty which mars the happiness of the rich as well as the poor, demands attention. It is forcing itself on public attention, both in the old world and the new. There is no escape from it. Sooner or later this problem must be faced, thoroughly examined by educated reason, grappled with and solved by the exercise of a cold calculation. Wealth must not any longer be the chief factor of human happiness." (*Scientific Meliorism.*) It is this terrible question of unjust distribution of wealth which the Neo-Malthusian leaves out of his reckoning altogether. He argues from the wrong premiss that population is the cause of poverty. That an utterly unrestricted, recklessly-increased population may to a certain extent be a cause I do not for a moment deny, but all who think seriously upon the matter can easily see that a disordered condition of economics and distribution is beyond all question the chief factor. It is to remedy these, not to endeavour to diminish population, which produces wealth, that the Neo-Malthusian should work.

Although population might be weak in number, where unjust distribution existed it is bound to be in as great poverty and wretchedness as if it existed in too great a quantity. "Civilization causes men to increase much more in wealth than in numbers." (Nitti.) Those who believe that Holy Scripture is a revelation from God must also believe that the order lying upon mankind is to increase, multiply, and subdue the earth. With a scanty population the latter is impossible, but a properly-arranged one acts as a goad to attain to it. It is a fact, which nobody can for a moment gainsay, that it is only in countries of large populations that inventions are discovered. What have Holland, Greece, Switzerland, for instance, produced for the world's welfare during this century? On the other hand, observe what England, America, and Germany have done in this respect, and what France did, ere she adopted the withering blight of Neo-Malthusianism. Evolution to better things, improvements of all sorts, are

the certain products of proper and fit numbers. Without them the world would stand still, and that we may readily believe is not the intention of the Creator. Judging from the past—and what better criterion can we have?—the future has for those who are yet to come, unknown and at present incomprehensible achievements. After closer study on this point some of the earlier Neo-Malthusians, like Mrs. Besant, have receded from their first and less reasoned out thoughts on the matter. In France, too, this has been the case.

Referring to those writers who had previously enthusiastically upheld Neo-Malthusianism, Schöne in his *History of French Population*, a book which all interested in this matter should read, says: "These were sadly deceived by the events of 1866 and 1870, amongst them Lavergne, whom I have just quoted. They sacrificed their previous convictions, and entered the ranks of those who were seeking to raise the birth-rate of France." Such, also, were Wolowski and Fontevraud. "While in prolific Germany Neo-Malthusianism still finds believers and apostles, in sterile France, where it was at first received and practised with enthusiasm, it is gradually losing ground. The continual diminution of the French birth-rate, at first slight and changing, but afterwards continual and dangerous, has had no effect but that of increasing the aversion to Malthusianism." (Nitti.)

Lavergne, for instance, in 1865, declared that the excess of population was the direct cause of poverty. In 1876 he publicly asserted that experience had proved to him that a numerical increase of population can be perfectly reconcilable with increasing comfort.

Guillard was at first devoted to Neo-Malthusianism, but statistical inquiry soon convinced him that instead of there being a necessary opposition between population and the means of subsistence, the former always proportions itself to the latter.

Legoyt also changed his opinion on the matter in the same manner. In 1894 Mantegazza wrote in *The Art of taking a Wife*: "Neither do I side with those who believe with too great a faith or fanaticism that a restriction in the number of births is sufficient to solve the social problem." Yet he is an enthusiastic Neo-Malthusian. His works dealing with this subject, *Elementi d'Igiene, Fisiologia dell' Amore*, and *Igiene d'Amore*, have been placed on the Index. Wolowski wrote

late in life: "Facts must be our guides. When one studies the state of things in France, we must say that those who advocate sterility there make a grievous error. In my view the increase of population is the end, the sign, of all progress." Schöne writes: "Those who hold Neo-Malthusian doctrines become every day more isolated."

No one for a moment will deny that the Neo-Malthusians have a great deal of unpleasant truth in their statements with regard to the pitiable condition of many of the working-classes now, but we totally disagree about the remedy they advance as likely to bring about a solution of that vast problem. A large population can never be a source of weakness, nor where just and true economic conditions prevail can it be a source of poverty. "Poverty is not simply the result of an excess of population. Many other causes go to produce it, and among them is a vitiated distribution." (Messedaglia.) This was especially the case with regard to the Irish and Indian famines. Quantities of food lay contiguous to the starving multitudes, yet they had not sufficient means to purchase any of it. "In France, under the old *régime*, in periods of great distress, regions where men perished of hunger bordered upon others where there was a menace of a superabundance of grain. Even where means of communication were not wanting, the internal duties very frequently caused the crops of one province to be insufficient, and caused deaths and atrocious suffering, while in another they rotted in the granaries, and by their cheapness were the cause of much more evil than good. The extreme localization of the sale of grain, as we have said, caused death in one province, while in another its abundance caused ruin." (Nitti.)

Nowadays we have improved upon such a false and barbarous state of things. We have, by means of modern inventions and a better mode of transit, the whole world to draw from for food, consequently a famine in a civilized country is a thing of the past. Besides, the fact remains that between the years 1818 and 1848 the increase of wealth in England was far greater than the increase of population. Yet it was the time of the greatest poverty and misery England has ever seen. According to Neo-Malthusian teaching there should have been none of either. The fact is that no matter what numbers of people practised Neo-

Malthusianism, poverty would remain just as urgent and severe, as long as the economic conditions remained adverse.

"Suppose that a hundred, a thousand, or a hundred thousand men followed the Neo-Malthusian precept, this condition would not be altered in the least, because the general conditions would remain unchanged. But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that this abstention were possible in an entire nation, the foundations of capitalist economy would remain the same, and the causes of poverty would remain the same. The argument which ruins the whole Neo-Malthusian structure, which makes poverty simply dependent upon excess of population and not upon the economic order, is the fact that the severest poverty has always occurred in countries and at times when the means of subsistence sufficed for the population and far exceeded it. In contemporary France food far exceeds the population, yet the persistence of the most squalid poverty, the frequency of crises, the continual agitation of the unemployed, are standing proofs that poverty is not the result of an excess of men over the means of subsistence, but of a vitiated distribution of food." (Nitti.)

Mrs. Besant graphically describes the miserable condition of the poor in pp. 239 and 240 of her autobiography. Their unmerited sufferings, she says, caused her to write her well-known book, but she ignores altogether the economic causes which lead to them. She laid them all at the door of over-population. We quite admit that, looked at from the point of view of this or that family, existing through want of a reasonable amount of foresight and prudence in marrying, but which would not be necessary in an ideal state of things, over-population may be a cause of poverty to certain individuals; but on the other hand, looked at from the universal, every increase of population is a potential increase of wealth for the whole community. "The supposition that excess of population is the cause of all poverty is completely erroneous, not merely in its practical conclusions, but also in its very essence." (Nitti.)

There is so great an amount of the crassest ignorance prevailing on all sides with regard to this subject of population, that we would do well to study it as closely as we can. There are many who say, let it increase as fast as it likes, only good can come out of the increase, the more there is

the better; never mind what individual suffering there may arise alongside of it, take no heed of those who are crushed out of existence and the joys of life through its working; let the weak go to the wall, let only the fittest survive; it is, after all is said and done, but the same struggle which goes on in all nature. This is technically known as the *laissez faire* system, that of Darwin, Guillard, Spencer, etc. Darwin said that it would form the mainspring of progress and of moral evolution. It has also been advocated by Frederick the Great, Rousseau, Filangieri, Botero (*Il Precursore di Malthus*), Adam Smith, Sussmilch, Sismondi, and Bodini. In a word, it is let the weakest die out and perish, who need care?

Spencer comments on the sins of legislators in interfering with the beneficent operations of the pitiless discipline which kills off the unsuccessful members of society; but he himself is criticized pretty freely by well-known writers. "Mr. Herbert Spencer's tiny knot of disciples who follow their master to the bitter end of individualist anarchism." Spencer's theory, according to Nitti, is that in the past the abundance of population was the chief stimulus to progress, since producing congestion it caused men to perfect themselves, and make them more fit for the conflict of life. But when the globe will be entirely inhabited, when it will be cultivated in its inhabited parts to the highest degree, when intelligence and the feelings suited to the highest degree will be developed, then the abundance of population, having served its purpose, will gradually cease. But he observes that Spencer's theory has found but very slight favour with economists. (See also Vanni.) Cossa says: "Herbert Spencer, whose unchallenged eminence is only equalled by his eccentricity, represents the theories of doctrinaire individualism in England"; and Cohn has charmingly remarked that his voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

"The number of the population constitutes the wealth of the State." (Frederick the Great.) "The government under which the citizens increase and multiply the most is infallibly the best." (Rousseau.) "The chief care of sovereigns desirous of procuring the happiness of their people was that of increasing the population." (Sussmilch.) "The truest indication of a nation's prosperity must be sought in the numerical increase of its inhabitants." (Adam Smith.) They

all asserted that without a high birth-rate there is not a sufficiently keen struggle for existence, and that without this struggle there is not merely no progress, but actual retrogression. The advocates of this cruel system do not stay to consider the individual suffering which must of necessity take place during the unequal struggle. It is their policy, not the teaching of Christ ; neither, we may be well assured, is it the wish of the Almighty.

The advocates of the *laissez faire* system are always, without exception, to be found in the ranks of those who enjoy the good things of life. They would not be so eager to advance the theory as they are if they themselves formed part of those who shiver and pine away from semi-starvation. "Beati Possidentes" is their welcome motto. Common humanity must feel for those who have to go under in the struggle, at least where anything of human pity remains. The ethical aspect of the *laissez faire* system will be fully discussed under the necessary reforms in marriage ; I merely give a statement of that idea here.

Then there are others, the Neo-Malthusians, who say, let us diminish population by every means in our power, then we shall have no competition, no want and misery, fewer numbers and more individual luxuries and pleasures. Like most things in this world, there is a great deal of truth in extremes, but the whole truth is not found therein ; generally speaking the *via media* will be found to contain the surest and safest guide. We are not justified in allowing population to recklessly increase, regardless of all issues ; neither are we, on the other hand, justified in recommending or adopting immoral and annihilating schemes with regard to it. We must always bear in mind the undoubted fact that increase of population means an increase of consumers as well as an increase of producers ; but we must equally bear in mind that unless we are able to bring the production to the consumption in equal proportions, the evil of an overplus of population goes on increasing, and that is what we are now suffering from.

With regard to an abundant population, wise men will say it is a source of strength and excellence, but at the same time we are bound to remove all unjust interferences and hindrances to its due support ; then population and its sustenance would go hand in hand together, one continually balancing the other ; one creating a steady, proper stimulus for the other

to increase *pari passu* with it. Above all, see that the marriage system, the *fons et origo* of it all, is properly secured on a firm and moral basis. Remember, also, that unjust, artificial barriers which exist between population and its maintenance are not of God's making, but of man's invention, through unjust and careless legislation.

"With it, the doctrine of Malthus, will die an older and still more pernicious belief that God has ordained the poor man's lot, with its attendant hopelessness and misery. The dawn of a brighter day seems breaking, when in time it will be perceived that poverty, and well-nigh all the ills of life, arise from man's ignorance and selfishness, and are curable as he grows." (Minton).

With regard to Neo-Malthusianism, we can affirm that the object it has in view, namely, of diminishing population, would remove all stimulus to attain to perfection, and so cause the unquestionable decay of any nation that was so blind as to adopt it. All right-minded people will, however, agree with the Neo-Malthusian when he says that marriage should not be a mere question of wealth, which it is far too much now. Sexual desire is a gift implanted in men and women with but one object, to reproduce their species. "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," is God's injunction laid upon the race, and anything which disturbs or vitiates that law will, we may be very sure, only bring about failure and remorse. Marriage, evolved by God's guiding hand out of promiscuous intercourse, is now the lawful and right sequel of a natural desire given to mankind to reproduce itself. It hallows sexual connection; it renders what is impure, unlawful, and immoral without it, pure, lawful, and moral with it. "Marriage is honourable in all." "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." "If they cannot contain, let them marry, for it is better to marry than to burn." "Forbidding to marry is a doctrine of devils." St. Paul sums up the argument very clearly. It is better for those who can exercise self-control not to marry; this is a higher and better state, the best precept we can follow, not however within the reach of the many; for those who cannot exercise the gift of continence, let them marry, and this will prevent vice.

Bishop Lightfoot paraphrases St. Paul's utterances on this subject in the following words:—"If I had my way I should

advise all men to lead a celibate life, like myself, in continence."

The Church, in her marriage service, echoes these thoughts. She declares that marriage is God's ordinance against vice, and gives the reasons for His ordaining it. "First, for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of His Holy Name.

"Secondly, it was ordained for a remedy against sin and to avoid fornication, that such persons as have not the gift of continency might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of Christ's body.

"Thirdly, it was ordained for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity."

The Neo-Malthusian asserts that his system would remove all the causes which tend to postpone this most desirable married condition for all, and he persistently cites the case of France as a proof in all his arguments, that what he says is true. Now everybody knows that Neo-Malthusianism has been and is now the universally accepted married condition of that country. It is very easy to note the results.

Let us first take the case of early marriage, which the Neo-Malthusian declares is a most desirable object to attain to, and see how it works out there. The percentage of marriages of men under twenty-five in 1892 was—in France, 27; in England, 51·3; in the rest of Europe, 39·3. The Rev. A. T. Lyttelton comments on these figures in *The Economic Review*, and remarks that if Neo-Malthusianism aims at inducing men to marry while still young, it has utterly failed in France, where it has had such a full trial. Dewey writes: "The Frenchman too often marries, if he marries at all, long after thirty." Another authority states that, roughly speaking, a little more than two-thirds of the Frenchmen who marry do so between thirty and forty years of age. Comparing the number marrying between twenty and twenty-five and those between twenty-five and thirty, the preponderance is in some countries on one side and in some on the other. In England the proportions are about the same; but in France only 24·58 per cent. of the men marry between twenty and twenty-five, while 42·36 per cent. marry between twenty-five and thirty. Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries follow the same rate as France. In Russia in

Europe 32.01 per cent. of men marry below twenty, of women 56.35.

Even moderately youthful marriages are not the rule in France. Mr. Lyttelton says: "Marriages in France are later than in England, whether you take the age of men or women." Dr. Drysdale, the President of the Malthusian League, incidentally remarked that "marriage is later in France than in England, and there is far more prostitution." Mulhall gives us the relative number in 1000 persons of either sex marrying at different ages:—

	UNDER 20.		MEDIUM MARRYING AGE.	
	MEN.	WOMEN.	MEN.	WOMEN.
England . . .	35	149	27.7	25.5
Scotland . . .	32	134	28.6	25.7
Ireland . . .	26	137	29.9	25.2
France . . .	23	204	30.2	24.9
Italy . . .	11	171	30.2	25.4
Prussia . . .	8	111	29.7	27.1
Russia . . .	373	573	25.2	21.5
Norway . . .	8	93	31.1	27.1
Sweden . . .	1	51	31.1	28.3
Belgium . . .	9	63	31.3	28.5
Holland . . .	23	99	30.9	28.0
Jews . . .	22	235	30.1	26.2
Vienna . . .	—	—	32.0	27.0
Leipzig . . .	—	—	28.9	26.2

If we study the whole marriage-rate of Europe, we do not find that the French rate helps the Neo-Malthusian case much. The Registrar-General of England gives the following rates of annually married per 1000:—

	1871-90.	1891.	1892.	1893.
Hungary . . .	19.1	17.2	18.4	18.6
Prussia . . .	16.7	16.3	16.1	16.1
German Empire . . .	16.4	16.1	15.9	15.8
Austria . . .	16.3	15.4	15.6	—
England and Wales . . .	15.6	15.6	15.4	14.7
Italy . . .	15.6	15.0	15.0	14.7
France . . .	15.4	15.0	15.2	—
Denmark . . .	15.2	13.6	13.6	14.1
Holland . . .	15.1	14.2	14.2	14.6
Switzerland . . .	14.7	14.4	14.4	14.7
United Kingdom . . .	14.4	14.6	14.6	13.9
Belgium . . .	14.2	14.8	14.8	15.2
Scotland . . .	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.2
Norway . . .	13.7	13.2	13.2	12.8
Sweden . . .	13.1	11.7	11.7	—
Ireland . . .	9.0	9.2	9.2	9.4

Schöne tell us that out of all France in the year 1884 only 6960 men below twenty married, and he tells us what were the ages of the women they married:—

3266	under 20
2419	20 to 25
886	25 „ 30
252	30 „ 35
88	35 „ 40
37	40 „ 50
12	50 „ 60

In the year 1887 the rate fell to—

2414	under 20
1836	20 to 25
637	25 „ 30
151	30 „ 35
41	35 „ 40
26	40 „ 50
5	50 „ 60

In Russia, where there is not a suspicion of Neo-Malthusianism, youthful marriages attain the most extraordinary dimensions. Levasseur gives the percentage of men and women married under twenty in Europe as follows:—

				MRN.	WOMEN.
Russia	.	.	.	37·8 ...	58·0
Scotland	.	.	.	3·1 ...	13·5
England	.	.	.	3·3 ...	14·4
Prussia	.	.	.	0·6 ...	10·3
Bavaria	.	.	.	0·2 ...	6·4
Italy	.	.	.	1·1 ...	16·9
France	.	.	.	2·4 ...	21·2
Sweden	.	.	.	0·1 ...	5·5
Norway	.	.	.	1·7 ...	0·9

Some almost incredible cases of Russian fecundity are on record. In the year 1757 the Empress Catherine received a peasant woman who had had fifty-seven children.

16	in 4 confinements.
21	„ 7 „
20	„ 10 „

This woman's husband married again, and he had fifteen more children by his second wife in seven confinements. Fedor Vassileff, of Moscow, in 1782, had eighty-three children living when pensioned by the Czar. He had had sixty-nine

children by his first wife at twenty-seven births, and after her death had eighteen more by his second in eight births. (Mulhall.) Richet, in *Dans Cent Ans*, states that Russia is the coming power of the world. All European populations are now diminishing except the Russian. Possessed of boundless territory, boundless resources, Russia is certain to become sooner or later the ruling power in Europe.

It would be interesting to follow up the figures from Russia, how far life in the army and agricultural pursuits bear these figures out. All who have written upon Russia and its people unite in saying that youthful marriages are the rule, and that the fecundity of the women is very great. Semenow says that early marriages are invariably the rule in Russia, for there parents urge their sons to marry at as early an age as possible, in order to gain another labourer for the family. Mackenzie Wallace says that celibacy amongst Russians is unknown; at 18 the youth is told he must marry. Wilkens says that the mean age Englishmen marry at is 26, Frenchmen 28, Englishwomen 24, Frenchwomen 25.

The following appeared in the *Pall Mall Magazine*; it may be read here with interest:—In England and Wales, at the present time, people are married at the rate of 1250 per day, the daily marriages numbering 625. If we allow 12 hours per day for the performance of the marriages we get a result of more than a hundred newly-married persons for each hour of every day in the year, not omitting Sundays, *i.e.*, nearly one marriage a minute. More marriages take place in London, in proportion to population, than in Lancashire, Yorkshire, or Nottinghamshire, the counties having the highest marriage-rate. Of every 1000 men who marry in England it is estimated by a competent authority that 731 do so between the ages of 20 and 29, taking partners of ages between 20 and 24. The last quarter of the year is the time most patronised for marriage, the first is the least popular.

Letourneau says that in England 504 men out of 1000 marry before 25, and nearly two-thirds of the women. This, he says, is only the case in France for 0.29 of the marriages of men. In Paris, he says, the rate of the marriage age is 40 for men and 35 for women.

The Registrar-General's Report gives the average age which men marry at in the United Kingdom as twenty-six and a half

for men, twenty-five for women. In England the highest marriage-rate is in cities and towns. The rate per 1000 makes London 17·6, Hertfordshire only 10·8. In England a tendency has arisen to defer marriage. In 1880 the average bridegroom age was 25·8, the bride 24·4; in 1891 the average age was for the former 26·4, for the latter 24·8. There is a similar tendency to defer it in France.

Moreover, marriage of any sort does not seem to prosper in France. The number of divorces in that country during the year 1884 amounted to 1,667; in 1894 they had increased to 6419. The exact figures are:—

1884	1667
1889	4786
1890	5457
1891	5702
1892	5772
1893	6184
1894	6419

The rate of divorce is higher in France than in any other country of Europe. It is lowest in Norway. Divorces are rapidly multiplying in every country in the world. The following are some statistics, taking 100 as a standard to commence with, given by Mayo Smith:—

	FRANCE.	SAXONY.	BELGIUM.	HOLLAND.	SWEDEN.
1850	. 100 ...	100 ...	100 ...	100 ...	100
1880	. 235 ...	105 ...	240 ...	151 ...	161
			1867-71.		1882-86.
United Kingdom	.	.	.	905 ...	2298
France	.	.	.	9850 ...	22,750
Germany	.	.	.	18,450 ...	29,140
Russia	.	.	.	4597 ...	6563
Poland	.	.	.	809 ...	1725
Sweden	.	.	.	619 ...	1109
Holland	.	.	.	700 ...	1570
Belgium	.	.	.	620 ...	1501
Canada	.	.	.	15 ...	52
United States	.	.	.	53,574 ...	117,311

Henniker Heaton gives the following present statistics of divorce:—

England	.	.	.	1 divorce in 577 marriages.
Russia	?	.	.	450 "
Scotland	.	.	.	331 "
Austria	.	.	.	184 "
Belgium	.	.	.	169 "

Hungary	.	.	1 divorce in 149 marriages.
Sweden	.	.	134 "
Holland	.	.	132 "
Baden	.	.	100 "
Roumania	.	.	94 "
Denmark	.	.	36 "
Saxony	.	.	33 "
Switzerland	.	.	21 "
Italy	.	.	21 "
Berlin	.	.	17 "
Vienna	.	.	13 "
Paris	.	.	13 "
Tolland County, Connecticut	.	.	6 "

Again, with regard to the marriage-rate per 1000, the International Statistical Institute tells us that Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Hungary, and Servia have the highest rates in the world: Massachusetts, 10·53; Rhode Island, 11·27; Hungary, 10·28; Servia, 11·29. The English average is 8·36; Prussia, 8·82; France, 7·89. There is a tendency to decrease all round. The last averages are England 7·72, Germany 7·93, and France 7·49.

Divorce does not seem to have any effect on the marriage age, which it might be expected to have. In America, where divorce is the rule and not the exception, the age is about the same as in Europe.

Levasseur gives the following figures, 1870-82 :—

PERCENTAGE OF BRIDEGROOMS.

	UNDER 20.	20-30.	30-40.	ABOVE 40.
Russia	37·8 ...	43·9 ...	11·8 ...	7·4
Scotland	3·1 ...	68·8 ...	18·8 ...	9·3
England	3·3 ...	73·4 ...	14·4 ...	8·9
Prussia	0·6 ...	67·2 ...	22·6 ...	9·6
Bavaria	0·2 ...	55·5 ...	30·0 ...	14·3
Italy	1·1 ...	61·9 ...	26·1 ...	10·9
France	2·4 ...	62·3 ...	25·1 ...	10·3
Sweden	0·1 ...	58·9 ...	28·8 ...	12·2
Norway	1·7 ...	62·1 ...	14·6 ...	11·6

PERCENTAGE OF BRIDES.

Russia	58·0 ...	33·2 ...	6·2 ...	2·6
Scotland	13·5 ...	68·9 ...	13·1 ...	4·5
England	14·4 ...	68·8 ...	10·9 ...	5·9
Prussia	10·3 ...	69·7 ...	14·9 ...	5·9
Bavaria	6·4 ...	54·8 ...	20·6 ...	8·1
Italy	16·9 ...	65·8 ...	12·5 ...	4·7
France	21·2 ...	59·6 ...	13·7 ...	5·6
Sweden	5·5 ...	65·0 ...	22·2 ...	7·2
Norway	0·9 ...	59·1 ...	27·6 ...	12·4

These figures, culled from various sources, do not show that early marriages are more the rule in France than anywhere else. Another item in the Neo-Malthusian programme, and upon which great stress is laid, is that its adoption would very largely reduce illegitimacy; but here, again, France is a standing proof that it does not. Illegitimate births among the population of France in 1892 were in the ratio of 8·4; in England, 5·3; in the rest of Europe, 6·4. In France this proportion is increasing, yet in England, although the marriage age is being postponed, it is decreasing. Writing on this matter in *The Westminster Review*, Mr. Dewey says: "Marriage (in France) being made difficult by law, illegitimate unions naturally abound. These produce children, who, for want of parental care, have the chances of life against them."

The following are the statistics of the matter in England per 1000:—

1845	.	.	.	70	1875	.	.	.	48
1855	.	.	.	64	1885	.	.	.	48
1866	.	.	.	62	1890	.	.	.	44
1872	.	.	.	54	1894	.	.	.	43

The returns of the last census in France give 8·9 per cent. illegitimates in all births; 24·7 in Paris, but only 3 per cent. in the Basses and Hautes-Alpes. In 1881 the general percentage was 7·5.

Levasseur, in *La Population Française*, gives the following percentage of illegitimacy in France:—

Department of the Seine.	.	.	.	24·1
Urban Population	.	.	.	10·1
Rural Population	.	.	.	4·2

Letourneau gives the following:

1800-1805	.	.	.	4·75	per cent.
1806-1810	.	.	.	5·43	"
1821-1825	.	.	.	7·16	"

He says the rate is constantly increasing. In Paris, according to Bertillon, more than a tenth of couples live in free love.

See also Block's *Europe Politique et Sociale*. Wappaus says that in France town illegitimacy to country is as 15·13 to 4·24 per cent. "Of the births in France during the year 1893 no less than 75,562 were illegitimate." (Whitaker.)

ARGUMENT OF THE NEO-MALTHUSIANS 51

The following is the present rate of illegitimacy in Europe per 100 :—

Bavaria	14·01	Italy	7·3
Austria	14·6	Belgium	8·7
Saxony	12·45	England	4·5
Denmark	9·4	Holland	3·2
Sweden	10·2	Ireland	2·7
Scotland	7·9	Ulster	4·3
Prussia	7·8	Connaught	0·8
France	8·4		

This latter in Connaught is the lowest in the world. For the ten years 1881-91 the rate of illegitimacy in some English counties was :—

Shropshire	8·2 per cent.	North Wales	7·0 per cent.
Cumberland	7·6 „	Surrey	
Norfolk	7·2 „	Middlesex	3·4
Hereford		Essex	3·3
Westmoreland			

This rate is almost constant.

The Registrar-General reports that there are three zones of illegitimacy in England, the Southern very low, the Midland something above the average, the Northern very high.

Prussia is the only country which has examined into the rate of illegitimacy according to religious belief, and the result is :—

Protestant	8·85 per cent.
Catholic	
Jewish	2·73

Oettingen says that in Gratz and Munich there are more illegitimate than legitimate children.

Mulhall gives the following figures. Illegitimacy in a 1000 births :—

1865-78.			
Greece	16	United States	70
Ireland	23	Belgium	71
Russia	31	Hungary	71
Holland	35	France	74
Switzerland	48	Norway	85
Canada	50	Germany	87
England	54	Scotland	93
Spain	55	Sweden	102
Portugal	56	Denmark	111
Italy	65	Austria	135

The rate prevalent in France does not afford much ground for the Neo-Malthusian argument that the system reduces illegitimacy. Its adherents also confidently assert that its practice would eradicate the great evil of prostitution. Let us again take the case of France and see what effect Neo-Malthusianism has upon it in this respect. The population of the United Kingdom in 1891 amounted to 37,797,000; the estimated number of public prostitutes, calculated by most competent investigators, amounted to about 315,000. The population of France in 1891 amounted to 38,343,192; the number of public prostitutes, estimated by skilled observers, to about 467,000. The estimated present population of London is 6,041,555; that of prostitutes about 50,000. The present population of Paris is 2,447,957; that of prostitutes about 40,000. Mulhall gave the following statistics in this respect in 1891:—London had 31,800 prostitutes; Paris, 26,990; Berlin, 27,300; Lyons, 5,520; Marseilles, 4,080; Bordeaux, 2,610.

Schöne attributes to the increase of prostitution in France one of the causes of its depopulation. Dewey, writing on the depopulation of France, in *The Westminster Review* for December, 1896, calls Paris "the world's brothel."

There is sufficient ground, then, for stating that Neo-Malthusianism, with regard to its alleged power of hindering vice, has not succeeded in France, where, everybody must admit, it has had ample scope. Moreover, looking beneath the surface in this matter, we can readily observe that prostitution presents many drawbacks to those women who evince a desire to follow such a calling there. In France they are only permitted to ply it under well-defined regulations, a close supervision and scrutiny by the *police des mœurs*.

The principle upon which foreign Governments act in this matter is, that if women, of their own free choice, deliver themselves over to prostitution, they shall not be permitted to infect the men of the race with the disease which necessarily follows upon the practice of that vice. They assert that women are the primary factors in the matter, and must be dealt with accordingly.

There is no such system in England; yet the number of prostitutes is less than on the Continent, where it is in vogue. In England they are free to come and go wherever they please. There are many moralists who uphold one system

against the other, and there are many who condemn both, without suggesting any preventative scheme. That prostitution will exist as long as the world lasts is, I suppose, to be admitted. Foreign Governments say that this great evil should be supervised, and placed under rigid control; that no woman need follow that vocation unless she pleases, and that if she does, in spite of every warning, she ought to deprive herself of personal liberty. Also, that the moral condition of their streets is far superior to English ones, where vice is horribly rampant, and open scandals and temptation are visible to the young of both sexes.

Writing on prostitution as it is carried on in London, Dr. Richelot says: "La Prostitution y marche sans entraves, sans contrôle, sans lois moderatrices, la tête levée, en plein soleil."

The French authorities say that it is utterly wrong that this great evil should be allowed to flaunt itself in public, and that if people are so depraved as to wish for it they should go in search of it, not have it brought prominently before them.

Of all the problems which affect mankind in its most vital relations, prostitution is the greatest; it is the one of all others that fanaticism should not be allowed to touch, yet it is that fatal thing which rules it most in England. Mr. W. S. Lilley admirably deals with the whole matter in "The Problem of Purity" in *The New Review* for January, 1895. He there writes of the terrible temptations girls have to undergo under our present unjust economic system. "Thousands of poor girls who know the bitterness of unsatisfied hunger, who endure the misery of that most bleak of all cold, the chill of starvation, who suffer torments of mind, wrong, and wretchedness, who are, in short, half-starved." Further on he also writes: "Fearfulness and trembling may well come upon us, and a horrible dread overwhelm us, when we reflect that here, too, we are confronted with that appalling fact, the inscrutable law of vicarious self-sacrifice. It is a profound and heart-piercing mystery, like that of animal suffering; a problem beyond the reaches of our souls." I do not agree about the mystery of it. It is caused by unjust economic hindrances to marriage; remove those and prostitution will cease. It never existed amongst savage races.

The women who follow this trade in France are confined to certain streets and houses, from which they are practically

unable to go out. Those who wish to know more of the rigid conditions under which they live can study the Blue Book in which is contained the evidence given before the Lords Committee held to investigate certain matters with regard to the "Protection of Young Girls in England."

That the Continental system has a deterrent effect upon a young girl about to launch herself into such a life may well be believed ; but that it has a reforming effect upon those who have abandoned themselves to it cannot be accepted. It is almost impossible for any woman to emancipate herself from it on the Continent. She is marked for her whole life, and her chances of reform are practically hopeless.

This whole question of the supervision of prostitution is a most difficult and complex one. Frenchmen themselves, in vehement language, condemn their own system. Daubie, the writer of *La femme pauvre du XIX Siècle*, says : " Mais qu'il se garde d'imiter La France officielle qui est la prostituée des nations." Dumas fils says : " Such a nation deserves that prostitution should devour it completely, and that is what is now coming upon us." The Continental system degrades a woman, and reduces her to a very low type, to a much greater bestial animal than can be thought possible. In a scarce pamphlet, written by a lady in Nottingham, treating of the *laissez faire* system of prostitution permitted in England, and the supervised one in France, says that an English prostitute looks down with horror on a French one, on account of her horrible, unnatural practices. Those who wish to study this nauseous subject further, how enormously prostitution is increasing in France, can do so in the writings of Duchatelet, Guyot, Dufours, Lacroix, Debray, Montagne, Rabutaux, Jeannel, Mireur, Reuss, and Lecours. Neo-Malthusianism, then, arguing from the case of France, which is always upheld to us as an example of its beneficent action, cannot for a moment be considered as a means for inducing early marriages, reducing illegitimacy, or hindering vice. The arguments in its favour, therefore, with regard to these three points fall to the ground.

THE EVILS OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

LET us deal first with its physical results. Medical opinion is overwhelmingly against its practice. I have been at some trouble to ascertain this, and I find it is undoubtedly the case. French physicians, who have a large acquaintanceship with its results in this direction, condemn it *in toto*, and with great vigour. Bergeret, in *Les Fraudes Conjugales*, says: "Every dishonesty in the generative action is an infanticide fatal to morality and civilization." Amelin, in *Le Libre Echange*, says: "La castration vaut mieux a tout prendre, qu'une prudence voisine de la pratique de l'avortement." Bourgeois, in his work on *The Passions*, says: "Conjugal onanism is a real social pest; every fraud is a choked germ rendered unproductive, an indirect infanticide."

Those who desire to pursue the foreign medical literature of the subject further can do so in *Les Fraudes dans l'accomplissement des Fonctions Génératrices*; in Dr. Meyer's work, *Conjugal Relations considered in relation to Population, Health, and Mortality*; in Dr. Richard's work, *On Generation*, especially in Oettingen's *Moral Statistics*, and in Vanni's writings on the subject, *Questioni Malthusani in Germania*, etc.; also Dr. Lagneau in the *Bulletin de l'Academie de Medicine*, 1890. "The French physicians who had at first adhered to Neo-Malthusianism now agree in demonstrating its dangers and evils." (Nitti.) See also Dr. Rochard in *Traite d'Hygiene Sociale*.

At the meeting of the British Association in Bournemouth, Dr. Marion Sims said that in consequence of the representations from the medical profession in America, the Government of the United States had ordered the destruction of all Neo-Malthusian literature in that country, and that when it came to be dealt with it was found to amount to tons weight. A most distinguished English physiologist tells me that it is utterly condemned as ruinously immoral by the whole medical

opinion of England ; that if child-birth is pronounced likely to be detrimental to the woman, continence must be the rule. It is rightly pronounced to be a conjugal fraud, and moreover immensely hurtful to those who practise it.

Dr. Martin, of Brussels, said hysteria is commoner in France than in any other country, in consequence of the universal practice of Neo-Malthusianism there. In a paper read by Dr. Broca before the French Academy of Sciences, he stated that Frenchwomen were becoming more and more diseased through its practice. "Refusing for the sake of self-luxury to gratify her natural feelings of maternity, she is driven on in the continual search of pleasure, in the rage for enjoyment, in the desire for intense personal sensations."

It is a curious fact that in France the proportion of still-born children is enormously high. Compared with other European countries which publish such statistics, it is in a 100 births—

Sweden	2'62	Germany	3'53
Norway	2'75	Austria	2'85
Denmark	2'72	Hungary	2'00
Holland	4'26	Italy	3'67
Belgium		Massachusetts	3'41
France	4'60	Connecticut	
Switzerland	3'80	Rhode Island	3'52

Neo-Malthusianism is causing Frenchwomen to become naturally infertile ; I am assured by competent French authorities that many of their countrywomen are becoming so in consequence of the great frequency of that practice. I am also told that in consequence of its wide adoption Frenchwomen are also becoming mere nervous wrecks, and that they consume enormous quantities of morphine and ether.

Dr. Pigeolet, of Brussels, said that a married woman's physical condition was far better when allowed to give birth to children than not, and her physiological nature was improved when her womb was allowed to have full expression.

Medical opinion likewise wholly condemns it in the case of men, for when it is practised there is no time when they cannot give expression to their sexual impulses, as there would be if their wives bore them children ; consequently they become sooner exhausted in sexual vigour. This is one of the reasons put forward to account for the present deterioration of the physical powers of the Frenchman.

Here are some of the opinions concerning it from the ablest English physicians of the day :—"There is no antithesis between medicine, morality, or political economy." "On the moral aspect of Neo-Malthusianism there can be no doubt whatever but that the practice is altogether unjustifiable ; it follows on this, that what is morally wrong cannot be right, either in economics or medicine." "It is physically, economically, and morally injurious." "As to the effects medically, there are so many different methods that no genuine statement can be made. But I have seen ill-effects follow to the nervous system from one practice, and I know of inflammation following another."

The medical aspect of Neo-Malthusianism is fully treated of in a paper read before the British Association, Obstetrical Section, in August, 1878, by Dr. Routh, now published under the title of *The Moral and Physical Evils likely to follow Practices intended to act as Checks to Population*. All those interested in the matter should read it. It fully describes the various diseases likely to follow upon such practices. It is published by Bailliere, King William Street, Strand.

Evolution of Sex says it would be well if the medical profession pronounced authoritatively upon the matter. It is a matter upon which, for the sake of the general public, the national health and welfare, it should speak fully. Doctors know very well how largely the practice is increasing, and the time has come when they should grapple with it. One of our greatest physicians writes of it: "The nervous system is very seriously affected and a condition of irritability and depression is induced, which makes life unendurable, or there may be hysteria. My opinion as to the injurious effects goes far beyond my actual experience." Another writes: "With regard to women the risks to health are great. Of course the means adopted are various, and the effects differ with the means. With some means the natural desire is unsatisfied, and the unrelieved excitement leads to degeneration and disease of the organs concerned. With some the risk is chiefly in the direction of local congestions and severe inflammations. In this way much suffering is produced, and in the weakly, life is in many cases shortened."

The fact is that from whatever side we view it, Neo-Malthusianism is an unnatural thing, both morally and physically, and must therefore bring its own punishment with

it. It must certainly be admitted that it would deprive the world of one of its most softening influences, namely, the presence of children. We have some experience of its results in that untoward, pampered, and conceited only child of French parents. In him we have a perversion of child-life, its beauties and affectionate influences are not found there. The artificial check system has to bear the credit of producing that ignominious specimen of impism. It cannot be denied that as far as regards child-life, its practice must be to the last degree injurious. If ill-instructed persons of low intellectual type are led—which under the system of Neo-Malthusianism they would undoubtedly be—to consider children to be mere nuisances and burdens, hindrances to personal enjoyment, we can readily understand what a fate there is in store for English child-life. In some cases this is already bad enough now, but what would it likely be if it should be still further despised and repudiated? It would gradually cease to be the holy thing which it is still fortunately considered to be, and more selfish, brutal considerations would inevitably arise in connection with it. Any practice calculated to bring child-life or love for children into contempt would undoubtedly tend to increase infanticide, child massacre, and ill-treatment of all kinds. “I didn’t want, and I don’t want the brat,” would be heard far more frequently than even it is now.

Those who are acquainted with French manners and customs know how very high the death-rate is amongst the children of wet nurses, who are so much sought after in France. Their children are left in the nominal care of relatives whose greatest interest is that they should not live, and they do not.

The child-life of home, the family life of England as our best poets sang it, and which happily many English children still joyfully live, as those who went before them did, have had an enormous effect in civilizing the nation and elucidating the best traits of English character. Are all these humanizing and refining influences to perish under the adverse influence of Neo-Malthusianism? If such a deteriorating and destructive force be allowed to gain a footing amongst us we may well fear for the future of our race. *Les enfants sont le ciment des familles.* (Denn.) Remove the presence of children from the home and family life, and we shall inevitably lose a great charm and become more and more hardened and brutalized.

It has always been the habit, following a natural instinct, for human nature to feel pity and compassion for a childless home. We know very well that barren women always have an unnatural craving for something, something to love, something to cherish ; it takes all kinds of forms, parrots or poodles. We know the manner in which Holy Scripture describes the condition of the barren woman ; in all ancient history it has been portrayed in something of the same way.

Yet this is the forlorn and melancholy condition which Neo-Malthusianism voluntarily works to acquire. It is to be earnestly hoped that the natural desire for children, divinely implanted in every human heart, will prove too great an obstacle for any attack which may be made upon it. Moreover, the English character, let us hope, is too sturdy, too self-reliant, too moral, too religiously inclined, to barter what it has hitherto experienced to be good and beneficial for a visionary and immoral scheme. Under a widely-spread system of Neo-Malthusianism, which there is, alas, grave fear to anticipate, there would be great danger of human nature losing much of its self-sacrifice, its devotion, its love, its charity, and its tenderness.

When the great Wilberforce was busily engaged in the Slave question, his friends tried to keep his children from him during the intervals appointed for meals and rest. It was thought that, as he was so hard-worked with such important State affairs, his little ones would trouble him too much. Having noticed their absence, he guessed the cause, and said, "Don't rob me of the little ones, I cannot get on without them ; their little prattle is my greatest relaxation." Dr. Holmes, of the United States, writes as follows upon this point : "There is one word when spoken that vibrates every chord of sensibility in our entire organism, and sends an echo of the sweetest melody of nature to our inmost soul—it is that of mother. But who can imagine a true mother, a true woman, who believes in the sacred laws of wedlock and yet to despise and rebel against the most sacred gift of heaven. Yet how prevalent is this crime in this day of our boasted civilization ! Can children, who thus perchance become the uninvited blessings to such households, hope for the best inheritance when those subtle yet potent prenatal influences are against them."

If children were only allowed to exist in accordance with

selfish schemes, if they were reduced to comparatively small and insignificant numbers, if some poor children of a family were told they were unwelcome, we may well fear for the future of child-life. The presence of children brings out the best traits of character; it stimulates parents to work for their sakes; it prevents wasteful extravagance. In these respects, as well as in many others which are obvious, children and family life are grand helps to form self-reliant, daring, and enterprising character, such as the English race has acquired through long effort, struggle, and impulse.

The refining effect of child-life is well described by Whyte Melville in the following touching words: "How many a matrimonial bicker has been interrupted and ended by the innocent smile of one of these little ones? How many an ill-assorted couple have been kept from separation by the hourly consideration of what should be done for the children? How many an evil desire, how many an unkind thought, has been quenched at its very birth by the pure, open gaze of a guileless child? The stern, severe man, disgusted with the world, has a corner in his heart for those of his own flesh and blood. The passionate, impetuous woman, beset by a thousand temptations, pauses on the threshold, and is saved from ruin when she thinks of her children. Sunshine and music do they make in the house with their bright, happy faces, the patter of their little feet, and the ringing echoes of their merry laugh. Grudge not to have the quiver full of them. Love and prize them while you may; the time will come when your life will be weary, as they take wing and fly away."

We can readily say that if the number of our children is to be curtailed according to the wishes of the parents, actuated by selfish motives, sloth and self-luxury would increase tenfold, as indeed we see both of these disastrous results occurring before our eyes in France. Witness the open immorality of the Second Empire, and all the present bribery and corruption there on all sides. Prominent men of every degree falling victims to the insatiable desire for luxury and self-gratification, which Neo-Malthusianism tells them are the only objects worth aiming at. A nation only consists of families in the aggregate. If we minimize or destroy the latter, most surely will the former follow suit.

If marriage and children are to be treated with contempt,

if French demoralization is to be imitated in England, our decadence is not far in the distance. If marriage be unduly postponed, as it is fast coming to be ; if when it does take place it is merely entered into for as long as the respective parties desire ; if it be undertaken merely for self-gratification ; if its duties with the responsibilities of children be utterly cast aside and despised as unpleasant nuisances, then marriage fails of its entire purpose, which is to create family life ; it becomes nothing but degradation. If England is to continue being the great nation it is, its people must continue, at all cost, to place family life in the forefront of all its desires and objects. Our opposite neighbours have long since adopted the other course, and the result is what their best friends are now never ceasing to deplore. Their fair fields are becoming depopulated, and strangers are coming in to cultivate them.

If a nation is to prosper in all that is worth prospering in, family life, with all its necessary purity and self-respect, must be upheld at all cost. If that be lost or degenerates, the nation soon follows suit ; on the other hand, if each individual be taught to have ever before him a noble ideal, one calculated to draw out the best sides of his nature, unquestionably the nation of which he forms a unit will be moulded into the highest forms of usefulness and activity.

"Every well-trained family home is a centre whence elements of social happiness and national dignity radiate. The country, indeed, which is most abundantly blessed with such homes amongst its people will ever take the lead in the march of civilization, for the amelioration of the world's barbarism and vulgarity is not so much the work of the arts and sciences as of the social sentiments. If we break up the family life, we injure the nation at large, which is but an accumulation of families." (*Physiology of Human Nature.*)

Well aware of this, great European writers utterly condemn Neo-Malthusianism as destructive to the best interests of child-life, and consequently to the prosperity of the nation that adopts it. In France, Letourneau, Guyau, Guyot, Cauwès, Beaulieu, Ott, Mille, Le Fort, Frary, Gide, Fouillée, Dumont, and Richet. In Russia, Tchernicewsky and Tellquist. In Italy, Messedaglia, Loria, Johannes, Vanni, Majoranna, Vigili, Colaganni, Zorli, Lebrecht, Ferraris, and Nitti. Amongst the most distinguished opponents of the system in Germany are Oettingen and Wagner. Of all Englishmen most competent

to give an opinion upon the matter, Darwin was the greatest. He was a great naturalist as well as a great individualist, yet he condemned the use of artificial checks to population by the married. He was, moreover, much influenced by the writings of Malthus on population, yet he did not descend to advise the theories of the Neo-Malthusians. Their system is, in a word, self-abandonment to luxury. It eats up every ambition and a proper desire to excel. It busies itself not with the grandeur of the race or nation, but in what way the idle and the indolent can best indulge their pernicious desires. It entirely subordinates the best interests of the community to the self-indulgence of the individual.

Yet what caused the old civilization to become decayed and vanish away but this? What else swept away the teeming populations and grandeur of Egypt, Babylon, and Nineveh? When we consider the waste that goes on in wealthy habitations, the outcome of self-luxury, which is considered nowadays to be absolutely necessary for existence, we are irresistibly reminded of the story of the millionaire who lost a great fortune, yet in the days of lesser wealth he is reported to have said, "I am really much happier now than I was before, as I get what I eat hot, which I never did previously, as I was so far from the kitchen." Everything nowadays is sacrificed in the intense hurry and scramble to be rich; the consequence is that the standard of morality was never so low. Formerly, in the more halcyon, earnest days of a sterner England, it was the moral worth of the man which proved an *open sesame*, not the length of his purse. This was unquestionably right, because the true, sound progress of a nation can only be measured by the character of its people. When a race became eaten up and disfigured by luxury and self-ease, when vice became its sole desire, it invariably declined in honour, vigour, and chivalry; finally it perished, and vanished away from off the face of the earth.

The undoubted object of Neo-Malthusianism is to relieve oneself of the nurture of those who in time would produce wealth and prosperity for their country and nation. Its tendency is to demoralize those who practise it, for its main object is nothing but how best to revel in secret indulgence and vice. Yet surely it is for the best interests of all nations that there should be high thinking and plain living, rather than the opposite, for if history proves anything, it proves that the love

of luxury and self invariably caused the downfall and abasement of every nation that was so foolish as to place them in the forefront of its desire. It is evident, all history assures us of the undeniable fact, that devotion to self-luxury and licentiousness, which Neo-Malthusianism must bring about, has had a most lamentable and ruinous effect upon rearing a vigorous and sturdy race.

Surely it is nobler to work towards simplifying one's life, to have a conscience void of offence before God and man, to remember that this world is not our all, to restore to England its old divine order of marriage and children, rather than to pander to self-viciousness and sloth, which inevitably tend to ruin both the individual and the nation, and which, it is sheer folly to deny, is destroying and depopulating France. The well-known lines of Juvenal come to one's memory—

“Nunc patimur longa pacis mala scævior urbi
Luxuria incubuit, victumque ulcisceritur orbem.”

“Prima peregrinos obscena pecunia mores
Intulit, et turpi fregerunt sæcula luxu
Divitiæ moles.”

When one thinks how little luxury is necessary for life, and yet a comfortable one, and how much absolute waste there is in luxuries, we may well place morality before them. That phrase, means of subsistence, is capable of a very wide interpretation. What it really means is the necessities, not the luxuries, of life. The wealthy classes interpret it to mean idleness, and to surround themselves with unproductive commodities.

Max Nordau aptly says that the larger the number of human beings who place their own interests higher than all the duties of solidarity, and all the ideals of the development of the species, the nearer the species is to the end of its vital career. He says that in such a case all family instinct dies out; the men do not wish to marry because they find it inconvenient to assume the burden of responsibility for another human life, and to provide for another human being besides themselves. The women avoid the pains and inconveniences of motherhood, and even when married strive by the most underhand means to remain childless. Decay and ruin, he says, must be the destiny of those peoples in whose marriages the selfishness of the contracting parties

celebrates its victories, while the child is unwished for, and even in the most favourable cases considered an indifferent accident. The decay of the Roman Empire is a striking object-lesson of this.

Horace, who was by no means an ascetic, condemned the tendency of his day to avoid or postpone marriage with a view to increase personal luxuries.

"Our youth diminished through the parents' faults." (*Odes*, II. 16.)

He likewise told his countrymen that they would be a greater nation if they expended less upon their food.

"O, when shall beans, the relations of Pythagoras, and other vegetables made savoury with bacon, be served at my table?" (*Satires*, II. 6.)

English society at the present day is taking a degenerate view of life, just as the Roman did when it was tottering to its fall. "Instinctively we think of Rome in the days of Augustus, when the well-to-do held back from marriage, and the retrospect and comparison are not reassuring." (Graham.)

"On that hard Pagan world disgust
And secret loathing fell,
Deep weariness and sated lust
Made human life a hell."

Commenting upon the present state of morals in France, Molinari writes in his recent book, *La Viriculture*: "À l'époque de la décadence Romaine on vit la prostitution se développer à mesure que les charges de l'entretien d'une famille, aggravées par l'impôt, agissaient davantage pour décourager le mariage." Describing the many causes which were bringing about the downfall of the Roman Empire, Juvenal, in his Sixth Satire, freely mentioned one:

"The wealthy dame is seldom brought to bed."

When the Roman women, anxious about their own self-indulgence only, refused to nurse their children, and came to look upon infanticide without any shame or horror, the empire soon fell. Is the same fate in store for modern nations now? The present generation in England has not been naturally nursed; its start in the world has not been according to natural hygienic laws; the consequence is that it is not half so strong or vigorous as the past were. It is anæmic to an

appalling degree; it faints at the slightest pretext. The modern soldier cannot march as his Peninsular ancestor did, or go through half the hardships he did, without dying off. The nation has become neurotic, neurasthenic, and decadent. The cause is not far to seek. A hundred years ago every English mother nursed her child, as her Creator intended she should, and which is the natural and proper thing to do, and bore one every two years. Nowadays the wretched infant is fed, not nurtured, on every sort of unnatural food and poison, and one is born every year, nature thus avenging herself; for owing to the great strain upon the mother the child is puny and weak.

Yes, we cannot deny it, we are a decaying race. Luxury will prove our downfall. Nothing in history, past or present, shows the decadence of a race more than the neglect of the mother for her child. Medical opinion is absolutely decisive that a mother should nurse her child, and that no other substitute is at all equal to that. All animal creation teaches us that this is the only appointed way. Did anybody ever hear of nations or races, up to a recent date, adopting any other method but this? We may be quite sure that no other is really satisfactory to the mother, no other suitable for her child. The self-surrender to luxury and idleness induces women to refuse to nurse their children—it is too irksome, too grievous a burden to be borne; consequently, from having in comparatively modern days done all they could to prevent themselves from doing their duty to their children, they now advance the plea that they are physically unable to do so. Quite so; this inability naturally ensued, for disuse brings about degeneration. Read Richet on this point, who shows how through unnatural food being given them the children of a race are inevitably bound to decay, and what numbers of poor children pine away and die from sheer hunger, helpless in their misery.

Nitti reminds women who professedly bear the name of Christian, and yet who practise Neo-Malthusianism, accompanied with a refusal to nurse their one child, that the Madonna, the highest type of womanhood, is always represented in Christian art with the Child in her arms, motherhood and childhood representing the self-forgetting love of the one and the fearless faith of the other; that human relationship which of all others is the purest, the sacred principle of maternity.

Young married Englishwomen should take warning from the fate of France and other well-known instances in history, that luxury is not the best school to be trained in or to train others in; and that life has not been given them to spend it in frivolity and uselessness, but, as St. Paul tells them, to bear children and guide the house. Canon Knox Little describes the present condition of English society as follows: "We find a state of society so terribly corrupt in some particulars, that it may be said to present some likeness to the state of things at the break up of the Roman Empire." Divine retribution in some form or other invariably falls upon a nation which disobeys God's laws. Sacred and secular history always testify to that fact. Nations rose to great eminence, and flourished gloriously for a time; they despised and rejected all moral law, and then faded and vanished away. "It is marvellous how history repeats itself, how nations first grow prosperous and then luxurious. The next stage is licentiousness, and next comes national decay. Other nations low down in the scale rise to eminence, only to be followed by a similar fate. Where are now all the proud nations that once dictated terms to the civilized world? Chaldæa, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain, and Portugal have all been left behind, and signs of natural decay in licentious France seem to indicate that her day has gone." (Churchill.)

It is to be hoped that better counsels will prevail than do now, and that Englishwomen will refuse to be led, as, alas, far too many are now being led, to consider that life is to be a mere scene of luxury and self-gratification without children, or if any, the smallest possible number. That is the one thing to be absolutely reduced at all costs; hedonism and children cannot exist side by side; then away with them, they circumscribe our pleasures. The thought is very, very full of evil presage for the future of the nation. The sex novel of the present day, and the revolt against maternity, show what is passing in the minds of many women of the present time. Marriage is to be free love and with no child-life. Lately, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Bravine asks us if it is feminine and seemly that young vicious Englishwomen should write books with the sole object of unsexing women, and so bring into being an unnatural creature devoid of all love and devotion? These peculiar creatures are invariably portrayed in the immoral but yet widely-read novels of the present day as revelling in free love, but refusing and repudiating maternity,

considering it much too grievous a burden to be borne by them. "Name me a position more abject. A woman with a child in her arms is to me the symbol of an abasement, an indignity, more contemptible, more disfiguring and terrible than anything can be." "I can't see that it makes so very much matter which particular woman looks after the children; any average fool would do." Love if you like, but do not have any children; that seems to have become the motto of fashionable society nowadays.

No religion, no nation, however savage, ever taught in past times such an unnatural thing as Neo-Malthusianism; it has been left for the latter part of this century to produce this monstrosity. In a family restricted to one child, which is usually the case in France, and becoming very much so in England, and which is the sole object of Neo-Malthusianism, where is the room for brotherly or sisterly affection, and the mutual self-sacrifice so profitable in producing a manly life, which can only be learned in homes through the self-denial and love of those who form them. Remove all these from English life and we shall have only one result, a nation composed of what the French are now—spoiled children without discipline, frivolous, self-conceited, quarrelsome, and petulant. Is the use of artificial checks to bring about the same results in England? That their adoption is becoming more and more prevalent here seems evident. Mantegazza writes: "Neo-Malthusianism governs the economy of the family in France, Italy, Germany, and even in chaste and fecund Albion." The whole birth-rate of Europe proves how rapidly Neo-Malthusianism is spreading.

BIRTH AVERAGE PER 1000.

	1871-90.	1891.	1892.	1893.
Hungary	44.0 ...	42.3 ...	40.3 ...	42.5
Austria	38.6 ...	38.1 ...	36.2 ...	—
Germany	38.1 ...	37.0 ..	35.7 ..	36.7
Italy	37.3 ...	37.3 ...	36.3 ...	36.6
Holland	35.2 ...	33.7 ..	31.0 ...	33.8
England and Wales .	34.0 ...	31.4 ..	30.5 ...	30.8
Scotland	33.6 ...	31.2 ...	30.8 ...	31.0
United Kingdom . .	32.6 ...	30.4 ...	29.5 ...	29.9
Denmark	31.7 ...	31.0 ...	29.5 ..	30.6
Belgium	31.0 ...	29.6 ...	28.9 ...	29.5
Norway	30.7 ...	30.9 ...	29.6 ...	30.7
Sweden	29.8 ...	28.3 ...	27.0 ..	—
Switzerland	27.4 ..	28.3 ..	28.1 ...	28.5
Ireland	24.9 ...	23.1 ...	22.4 ...	23.0
France	24.6 ...	22.6 ...	22.1 ...	—

I will give, under the heading of "Population," quite sufficient evidence to prove that Neo-Malthusianism is increasing in England. Commenting upon its increase in Germany, Nitti writes: "The proposals of the English Neo-Malthusians have found a large acceptance, notwithstanding their distasteful character, which would have caused their repudiation by a nation imbued with ideality and the Christian spirit." Mille, while deploring its widespread use in France, makes one laugh at what an army composed of only sons—and that is what the French one is coming to fast—would be like. In a family where the children, in the true sense of the word, are naturally allowed to increase, we have a healthy rivalry and a legitimate ambition to succeed in life, a proper stimulus to exertion. Where there is unhappily but one child all these must certainly be lacking. "Every measure which tends to enfeeble the energy of man is an arrest of development." The indulgent and exotic manner in which the single child of France is treated has considerably augmented the degeneracy of that country. The evidence of the state of things which existed in France previous to the war of 1870 was clear and decisive, that luxury and immorality had eaten out the very vitals of the nation. It could not be otherwise; nurtured in every extravagance, pampered in every luxury, frugality despised, the French then rushed upon their ruin. Their manhood, their virility, their best qualities, were sapped at their very core; the power to go forth conquering and to conquer was annihilated. In a very special degree, during that terrible time of trial, the German love of home and child-life, with all its necessary virtues, carried that nation through the greatest ordeal it ever had to undergo. Search the world through and it will always be found that countries and nations in which the divine laws of marriage are upheld are invariably the most powerful and the most prosperous; it could not be otherwise. How could it be supposed by any Christian that the divine laws of marriage and the moral procreation of children, which are the surest foundations of social and civilized life, may be disregarded with impunity? I well remember the words of an old Catholic Legitimist doctor in an obscure town in France, when he deplored to me the terrible expiation which his country would yet have to undergo, in consequence of her utter disregard for the moral laws of God. Signs are not wanting to show that

France is rapidly nearing a precipice. Her debt is the largest ever incurred by any nation, her taxation in consequence is becoming unbearable, yet her children are more and more limited in number, and family life is being broken up. Unrest and disquietude are apparent everywhere, and her army and navy are being continually increased beyond any necessity.

Healthy homes in all senses of the word, moral lives, healthy sons and daughters, are the life of the nation. Despise, depreciate these, and soon a cataclysm will come. "It must be remembered that the members of a large family educate one another; they are usually more genial and bright, often more vigorous in every way than the members of a small one." (Marshall.) In his evidence on the selection of candidates for the Indian Civil Service, Sir William Gull said that those candidates who were members of large families were the strongest. Galton quotes from a letter to him by Holland, in which the latter states that Franklin's advice to a young man in search of a wife was to take one out of a bunch of sisters; and also quoted the popular saying, that kittens brought up with others make the best pets, because they had learned to play without scratching! He also says that the members of a small family are much more selfish than those of a large one, and that a higher morality is oftener found in the latter than in the former. Richet points out to us how that in a family of one child only, this child, when it becomes a man, may be represented by an annual income of £120, but in another family of ten children, in a country where there were no unjust or artificial obstacles to the production of wealth, these ten children would be able to make ten times £120. Herein, in a word, seems the most conclusive proof of the adverse influences of Neo-Malthusianism.

Not so very long ago, France, with a much larger population than we had then, had a much better chance of increasing her possessions and wealth than we had, but already the artificial check system had begun to take effect, and the result is what we see to-day in the volume of the trade belonging to each respective nation. In the year 1895 England's total trade stood at £700,274,704; that of France at £385,531,016. And yet we see amongst short-sighted, yet well-meaning people in England, so-called philanthropists, an increasing tendency to diminish population. A wiser course for them to adopt

would be to put forth their best efforts to remove all obstacles in the way for it to gain the wealth of its own labour, which is the true principle to work for, instead of to lessen the power of production, that which is in the end most conducive to the welfare of both the individual and the nation ; granted, as we shall examine into later, that it should be an ordered, not a disordered population. The nefarious system of one child only now waxes great in France ; its results there we can witness before our eyes, and take warning therefrom. Child-life in that country is considered to be a nuisance, as something detrimental to happiness. Vogue writes with regard to this : "Children, one sometimes, that still happens." Dr. Lagneau writes that "in some parts of France the words brother and sister are seldom heard." Dr. Rochard : "A family of five or six children was once an ordinary thing, now it is regarded as a veritable affliction." Yet, if Frenchwomen would read Westermarck, they would see that he unhesitatingly declares that the nations which value children are always the strongest in valour, worth, and morality. "French literature, which is a reflection of the morality of the dominant class, has been fatal to the spirit of family unity." (Nitti.) "O mères Françaises, faites donc des enfants pour que la France garde son rang, sa force et sa prospérité. Je voudrais qu'une société nouvelle en sortit, de braves hommes, de braves femmes, de ménages ayant chacun douze enfants pour crier la joie humaine à la face de soleil." (Zola.)

Dumas fils gives us in *Francillon* an amusing dialogue.

"And you have only one child?"

"How many do you want me to have? I have only been married a year, ten months, and seven days. I could not have five like you."

"Of whom two are twins."

"What a horror! And you have nursed them both?"

"Both."

"Even the twins? Oh! merciful goodness!"

We can also read what Clothilde is made to say by Zola in *Dr. Pascal*.

In English society the disinclination to maternity is increasing day by day. The fact that a fresh being has been called into life is not a subject for joy.

Women do not seem inclined to feel as Marguerite felt in *Faust*, that teaching the babe was the holiest of all joys.

There is not delight that a man has been born into the world, but rather that one has been prevented from coming into it. Lately, in a speech at Chester, the Rev. Benjamin Waugh—and who is a better authority on child-life in England?—spoke of the disinclination to bear children evinced by society of the present day, and said it was caused by self-indulgence, blue china rather than babies, fashionable resorts, and a large amount of public notoriety, with very little time spent in the nursery.

Yet Sir J. Crichton Browne tells us that the family is the social unit, the nursery of goodness, the school of character, the germ-plasm of the loftiest virtues, for it is by a diffusion of the feelings that well up within its precincts to the class, the nation, and the race, that we become public-spirited, patriotic, and philanthropic. The savage owes to it his first glimmerings of ethics, and we in this country owe to it all the prosperity we enjoy, and that the family is moreover the fountain-head of altruistic emotions, the palladium of sound morality.

It is not hunger or the fear of it for their children or themselves that urge on the well-to-do of the present day to artificially limit the number of their offspring. It is merely an insatiate desire to keep in society, to gratify one's own personal luxuries, selfishness, and self-indulgence at any price. Simplicity of life, which we may be quite sure is necessary for healthy living, is dreaded as an awful fate to befall anybody. It is a common custom in English society now to arrange before marriage that there shall be only one child or none at all. This is quite commonly quoted as "the pre-nuptial arrangement." The Rev. A. T. Lyttelton said, at a meeting of clergy held to discuss these matters: "The increasing practice of such methods among all classes of society. I know for a fact that these plans for checking conception are known and practised by many ladies in London society, and I believe doctors will tell you the thing is on the increase." We do right in believing that the practice of Neo-Malthusianism is immoral. It is strangling human life in its very source. The degrees between it, abortion, and infanticide are very slight. What distinction can there be between it and the latter? "The consequences of Neo-Malthusian doctrines would be gradually to abolish the sanctity of human life, and to condone, or rather to sanction and approve,

deliberate murder." (Father Clarke, S.J.) Anything calculated to interfere with or depreciate the sacredness of human life must, from the nature of the case, harden and brutalize both men and women. The very thought which puts Neo-Malthusianism into action arises from hatred and disinclination to cherish infant life. Those who practise it are bound to set a low value on life, and to consider it a mere matter of accident. What can be the religious belief of those who destroy the initiation of life? Decay of religion and Neo-Malthusianism are bound to go hand in hand together. Where the former is present the latter follows as a matter of course, and *vice versâ*. Such is the case in France, and, alas! there is every reason to fear that the same is taking place in England also.

Christians must believe that it is contrary to the will of God, inasmuch as it frustrates His will, appointment, and wish. It is unnatural, because it is contrary to all laws of morality, reproduction, and nature itself; the latter cannot be thwarted; if it should be, troubles are certain to arise. It seems impossible that a morally-minded couple should conspire together against the intention of the Almighty, and nature itself, that the lawful intercourse of marriage should be followed by the production of other lives. In making use of artificial checks they together compass the destruction of the life of the germinating seed of a living soul. God has instituted marriage for the reproduction of human life, and also for the protection of women, in the right and lawful sense of the word. The Divine law laid upon human nature, as indeed on all animal creation, is that the male should be creative and the female receptive. To fight against or resist that by immoral means is fighting against the natural order of the whole world of sentient beings. Have we arrived at the period of the world's history when the natural God-given instinct of motherhood is to be annihilated? Is giving life to another to be considered a repugnant and distasteful task by the women of the present day? It would seem like it. Is the final issue to be that marriage and the reproduction of human life, with all their accompanying results, the Divine and natural order of human affairs, must be sacrificed, in the case of the great majority, because of the unjust distribution of wealth now prevailing? Everything seems to be trending in that direction. In consequence of the want of

sufficient means to marry upon, an astounding state of things has arisen in Germany. Max Nordau describes it as follows:—“There is in Germany a curious state of affairs which is actually unknown elsewhere, and which I must admit greatly reduces the burden of a standing army. All over the country there exists a species of free union, which really results in what would probably be styled elsewhere a series of temporary marriages. Money plays absolutely no part in the arrangement. Indeed, when the couple are out the woman always pays for her own refreshments, and while they are practically keeping house together mutual faithfulness is an absolute *sine quâ non*. It frequently happens that, after a certain number of these affairs *de cœur*, the woman, who is often a worker in a factory or great workshop, contracts a legal marriage which legitimatises all the children born out of wedlock, who are thus covered by the cloak of marriage. This state of things has become so universally recognized that even if the mother does not subsequently marry no disgrace attaches to her children. In the army, of course, this curious bride and bridegroom system plays a considerable part, and you will find it flourishing exceedingly in each garrison town. Each German soldier is entitled to only one meal a day, and if he can secure a temporary wife (she is nearly always, be it noted, someone employed in a bourgeois establishment), he thinks he has done well for himself. This is so true that each German housewife recognizes it as a matter of course by providing extra food for this strangely unofficial visitor to the kitchen.” It is evident that this extraordinary state of morality must serve as a direct stimulus to prevent conception, as children would be very much in the way of these establishments. We can easily see that there are many forces in Europe at present tending to hinder the presence of children. We read in a novel written by an Englishwoman, “Children have been the means, from time immemorial, of enslaving women.” “Maternal instinct is the scourge of genius.” “This reproductive rage held them (women) on the animal plane.” “Are women to be simple productive agents of inferior quality?” “What thousands of women there are to whom the birth of children is an intolerable burthen and a fierce misery, from which many would escape by death.” “Motherhood, as our wisdom has appointed it among civilized people, represents a prostitution of the

reproductive powers." So Hadria is made to speak. Yet Aristotle, the greatest of thinkers, said that no higher or holier tie to all that was noble could exist than the child. In a simpler style of living—now, alas! considered mean—to be a mother was thought to be the chief glory of a properly-minded, virtuous woman. In these more complex days this is no longer considered to be the case. But surely a husband without a child, and a wife without one, and their condition self-willed and achieved, merely results in the one being a male and the other a female. Commenting upon this sort of connubial arrangement, a certain Italian writer says: "A marriage inspired only by the desires of the flesh, maintained only by the bread of lust, is a very poor and abject thing that can very rarely give peace to the mind, and much less happiness.

"Even in the most vulgar and sensuous natures there is something that rebels against the permanent animal, and raises its voice in demand for a more human form of food. Man, like the swine, wallows in the mud, but with this difference, he likes to look up to the heavens from the trough.

"It must be added that in marriage the dignity of father and mother only increase the responsibility of the two consorts to animate and enlarge the human feelings at the expense of the animal pulp. The spirituality of the family impresses itself upon the coarsest nature and the most obtuse nerves, by warming the atmosphere and revealing a streak of blue in the heavens above. Woe to the man who, in solitary and sad contemplation of his wife, says to himself, My companion is only a female. Much worse is it, and woe to that woman who in the night-watches, looking at her husband as he snores, says in a low, fretful voice, My husband is only a male."

Yes, it is true; those who wilfully, by the use of artificial checks, bring about childlessness, barter and change the sacred possession of a child for a vile prostitution of flesh and bank-notes. There is a growing indifference, a positive hatred, to child-life growing up steadily. For instance, why should children be termed "encumbrances"? Does not this appellation signify contempt, and that they are mischievous burthens? How often we see advertisements for men and women to fill responsible situations, "no encumbrances." The applicants must be married, yet they must be childless. Does

not this course of conduct lead directly to immorality? Again, we notice that even the clergy, when advertising their houses for hire during the summer, make use of similar words, "no children," "no encumbrances." Everything is tending to eradicate child-life out of the land. The curate seeking work at a church declares, as one of his suitabilities for the post, that he is married but has "no encumbrances." All these things, taken together, prove the truth of the remarks of Her Majesty's Judges of Assize, namely, that never were there more crimes against morality and children than there are now.

The self-destruction of the whole nation is looming perilously in the future; the declared will of God is thrust defiantly out of sight; it interferes with pleasure, therefore it must be ignored and treated with contumely. Writing upon Neo-Malthusianism in *The North American Review* for September, 1896, Father Clarke, S.J., admirably makes use of the following burning words: "The practices advocated by the Neo-Malthusians are most serious offences against nature and nature's God. In the eyes of men, those who are guilty of them may pass for honourable and virtuous citizens; but in the eyes of Him who sees in secret, the poor wanderer in the streets is far less culpable than those who set at naught, for the sake of their own comfort and enjoyment, the laws that God has laid down to regulate the increase of the human kind." I advise my readers to study the whole article; it is short, it does not profess to enter deeply into the matter, but it is well worthy of study by those who are interested in this most important question. The luxurious habits of Englishmen have caused children to become too costly a burden to maintain, therefore they must be suppressed. "There is something worse than death. Cowardice is worse. The decay of enthusiasm and manliness is worse. And it is worse than death, aye, worse than a hundred deaths, when a people has gravitated down into the creed that the wealth of nations consists not in generous hearts, fire in each breast and freedom on each brow, in national virtues and primitive simplicity, and heroic endurance and preference of duty to life; not in men, but in silk and cotton, and something they call capital. If wealth accumulates and men decay, better far that every street in every town of our once noble country should run blood." (Robertson.)

Mammon, not natural love, not patriotism, not the possi-

bility of enriching mankind or the world with a clever child and man, has become the chief object of life. Success in money-grabbing is considered the only standard of right. Temporal interests form the absorbing ideas and conversation of society. Most people refuse to believe that self-denial, which, after all, brings greater happiness than luxury, a splendid national character, is of far more importance than national wealth. "Our modern society is suffering from gold fever; this contributes more than anything else to corrupt the roots of marriage."

Anybody who, no matter how cursorily, observes the tendencies of modern life, must admit that the dictates of Christian morality are being entirely sacrificed for personal wealth. The future greatness of the nation or race is ignored, all must be subordinated for present luxury and self-abandonment. The interests, the hopes, all that centres round the desire for a new and heavenly country, the vast issues of a future life, are cast aside in the interests of the present. The corruption of the moth and rust are no longer believed in; "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The present is so very real, the future so very doubtful to many who still nominally profess to believe that they ought to lay up for themselves treasures in heaven and not on earth. The fact is that economic influences are changing the whole aspect of human nature and killing all purity and morality. "With the increase of needs, with the advancement of the standard of life, there grows an aversion to a numerous offspring, even among the women of the lower classes. In all this there is an egotistical feeling which constitutes one of the great perils of modern nations." (Nitti.) All that now interferes with one's personal luxuries, no matter what—morality, righteousness, justice, honesty—all are cast aside in the mad pursuit of wealth. Yet a great English writer and authority tells us that to live for oneself is to lose oneself, and that to live for others is to gain oneself and all the world besides, and that blessedness and righteousness, and not merely happiness, should be our aim. There can be only one rendering of that sentiment.

It is also amazing to read all the Neo-Malthusian literature of the day, and observe how all idea for the future economic welfare of those who are to succeed us is ignored. Temporary easement is all that is considered. Whatever amount of bene-faction Neo-Malthusianism might have on the present condition

of the poor—and that we will consider later on—it cannot by any means be taken to apply to the well-to-do, who merely curtail the number of their children so as to enable them to indulge in hedonism. Frequently we find in Neo-Malthusian writings the attention of the poor called to the wide practice of the artificial check system amongst the rich, and blaming the former for not more largely following their example.

Formerly it was considered the wholesome duty of the educated and well-to-do to set an example of high morality and Christian practice. Nowadays the position is reversed. Those in high places have acquired the knowledge which enables them to indulge in sexual intercourse without becoming parents, and they have unhesitatingly adopted the practice. But after all, there must be an inner chord of natural affection and a craving desire in every woman's heart to hear the word "mother" addressed to her. Who can imagine a true married woman, who believes in the sacred ties of motherhood, deliberately refusing the lawful gift of a child? To her a child can never be an uninvited blessing. She can never be what the flippant, vulgar, and unnatural English-women writers of the day describe as a "propagating drudge." What have we come to in England when a mother is so described! But to which of the two, the self-complacent, yet unnatural, irreverent, and childless Neo-Malthusian woman, or the "propagating drudge," will conscience and remorse speak loudest when face to face with death? In the case of the one, the loving, dutiful, devotional care of children will be absent; in the other, sons and daughters will strive together to soothe their mother's trouble and pain. Which is the prettiest picture? Those who oppose nature will always suffer in some way, and in none more so than when they oppose nature and morality combined. Here is where the evil effects of Neo-Malthusianism can be most clearly seen and observed. "The nations which artificially limit their fecundity arrive at such bestial corruptions as would not only alarm Malthus, who was an honest man and an Anglican priest, but any tolerant spirit." (Oettingen.) "It is not only Christian morality which considers Neo-Malthusianism to be an infamy, but the morality of all times and places." (Ott, *Journal des Economistes*, August, 1888.)

The sin and evils of Neo-Malthusianism come home to the human heart very effectively when a man, looking upon his

healthy, happy child, says, I could have prevented that child's life.

As Christians we can very readily say that it is a sin: the whole Church condemns it, and declares that its sole object is merely to promote self-luxury. (See Appendix.) "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "A man's life consisteth not in the things that he possesseth." We must readily believe that the practice of artificial checks to conception must degrade the finer moral instincts of both men and women, especially, of course, the latter: in them it cannot have any other effect than to bring about a bestial sensuality and indifference to all morality.

"Turning the use of the woman into that which is against nature" must surely act terribly upon the woman herself who practises it, or allows it to be practised upon her. The husband at his marriage recorded a solemn vow before God that with his body he would worship or do honour to his wife—"with my body I do worship." Is this practice which we are considering in accordance with that vow?

Jeremy Taylor wrote that he is an ill husband who treats his wife as an animal or a harlot, having no end but pleasure. Moreover, it must be remembered that women must always be factors in the scheme, and that if their morality is debased the worst consequences must ensue in every direction. "*C'est de la moralité de la femme que dépend tout l'avenir d'une generation.*" (Marsangy, *Etude sur la Moralité de la Femme et de l'Homme*. Paris, 1890.) In earlier days, when a higher standard of morality was in vogue, and nothing of the "Sexual Revolt" was heard in the land, Englishwomen protested against the practice, which they rightly considered aimed at lowering their morality and finer feelings. I well remember some years ago, at a certain Parliamentary election, a candidate, who shall be nameless, was ignominiously defeated, solely through the influence of the women, it having been noised abroad that he was an advocate of Neo-Malthusian practice. The men granted their wives' appeal and rejected him. It seems very difficult to believe that any pure-minded woman could so far abase herself as to adopt it. "Men are God's trees; women are God's flowers." Nature has designed women for one especial and peculiar purpose, that of bearing children, and everything in her has more or less close con-

nection with this, her original and inalienable vocation. If that instinct be thwarted or perverted she becomes discontented, craving, and morbid. Women have not been created by God to practise immorality. It is a thing alien to their best instincts and nature. If they persist in doing so they at once cease to be in their natural sphere, and they themselves and the race will undoubtedly suffer. Fifty years hence will tell a gruesome tale if women now surrender themselves to practise a system which is both physically and morally in entire opposition to their proper welfare. "Woman is, under God, the true creator of personal character, and in the aggregate, of national character also, for the destiny of a nation, so far as human instrumentality goes, is really the charge of each succeeding female generation. Senators may make the nation's laws, statesmen may wield the national resources, universities may perpetuate its learning, but the women of the country develop its moral characteristics, and like as the mind, and not the physical being, constitutes the man, so the moral features of a people, and not their geographical situation, nor political relations, constitute a nation in the eyes of Him who rules and will judge the world." (*Physiology of Human Nature.*)

Neo-Malthusians must necessarily admit that the practice they urge, as a remedy against poverty, is an entire perversion of the laws of nature. We may guide and lead nature, but we are certainly not justified in opposing it. Those who believe in Christianity must admit that it is contrary to its teaching. This most surely follows as the night the day. Therefore, before people adopt Neo-Malthusianism, they must have convinced themselves that Christianity is false. I feel assured, however, from what I know of Neo-Malthusians, and it is not a little, that they only urge their system in consequence of their sincere belief that it will prove a universal panacea for all the troubles we are rapidly becoming encompassed with. They firmly believe that population must always outrun the means of subsistence. They do not or will not see that what they in preference ought to do is to endeavour to remove all impediments to the increase of food, and to an equal and just share in property.

This was what Mr. Bradlaugh and his school could not perceive. He persisted to the end of his life in declaring that the only possible remedy was to restrict population. His belief is

now altogether discredited by all who can pay any educated attention to the matter. The advocates of the system shrink with horror from bringing more life, which they would naturally love and cherish, into what they believe is an overpopulated arena of suffering. They hesitate to increase the suffering, and finding sexual impulse too strong to overcome, they adopt a means to satisfy it without what they term evil results following.

The time most certainly has come when these most important questions will have to be very seriously considered by those who desire to uphold the morality of marriage and the prosperity of the nation. The inequalities of wealth have now become so deleterious to everything which is most conducive to the welfare of the race, that some steps will have to be undertaken to reduce the terrible hindrances which at present exist to entering upon proper marriage. The ignorant and rash are taking the matter into their own hands, and are attempting to solve the various problems involved by adopting the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. For the first time in the history of the world civilization is face to face with one of the influences most destructive to its own progress. People are always prone to judge too hastily of the symptoms of the disease, and not to look to its causes.

Great allowance must be made for opposing economic influences. After all, there is a lurking suspicion that this practice cannot be quite right. *The Malthusian* itself speaks of "braving the indecency of artificial checks." Yet, in the same number from which the above extract is taken, it quotes Robin as follows:—"To make known in suitable places this useful knowledge, so practical as it is, gentlemen, is an apostolic mission to which I invite you." Another writer says: "Under conditions respectful to human dignity, a knowledge of Neo-Malthusian art should be carefully instilled."

It is quite impossible for any professing Christian to defend the practice, for it certainly presupposes that there is no such thing as any Divine interposition or guidance, either in the world or in the individual. With the materialistic Neo-Malthusian, of course, no religious argument can apply or have any moral force. Mrs. Besant points this out very clearly in her autobiography. On becoming a Theosophist she renounced Materialism, and consequently Neo-Malthusianism. She says that when she advocated the latter she considered man to be

but an organism which was produced on the earth and perished upon it.

To the materialistic Neo-Malthusian, therefore, there is no other seemingly available course to deal with population but brutally to suppress it. The religious aspect of the question has no concern for him. Man is a mere generating animal, like all lower forms; hence it follows, as a matter of course, that the reproduction of mankind can be treated like that of cattle, cats, and dogs. Granted that his premisses are true, there can be no sin or immorality in adopting his system. He does not believe in a future life; he says that all he can work for here during his present life is to do all he can to prepare better places for those who may be destined to succeed him; but if his advice to make use of artificial checks be adopted, there will be few to profit by his work. So very few people are logical in their thought and action. The man who practises Neo-Malthusianism must consider that all human life is only connected with this world, and has no future before it. It is but a purposeless dream, "a vain Bacchic dance of idiot atoms careering on their way from a nebula to a charnel house." Even if there be no God, it is better to be chaste than licentious, for nature will certainly punish those who are breakers of her laws; if they prostitute themselves they must suffer physically. Syphilis is the result of prostitution, which is in itself unnatural. It is threatening to consume the very vitals of the nation; it is the just punishment that fastens itself upon a society which, owing to an unjust system of economics, heaps up every hindrance and artificial restraint to lawful marriage. To be logical, then, the materialistic Neo-Malthusian must believe that when he becomes aged and generally useless he ought to be placed in the lethal chamber like the dog, and there end his mortal career. He believes that human life has no future before it; he refuses to call it into existence; he ought logically, therefore, to end his own whenever he pleases. The Epicurean, whose view of religion was similar to his, was logical; he believed that when life had been made the most of it was time to end it, and he did. Directly Mrs. Besant believed that man is immortal she naturally threw over Neo-Malthusianism, being convinced that not only is it immoral in itself, but that it is only putting one evil into the place of another. The materialistic Neo-Malthusian deals only

with the gross aspect of human propagation. He adopts a course in accordance with his belief. But even in his own, the purely economic aspect of the matter, we can readily see that he is in error. That side of the problem has within it facts which he cannot easily gloss over or surmount, such as the hindrance to prosperity, and the decay of the nation which would adopt his ideas. It is essentially, then, an act of cowardice which would sacrifice the prosperity of the nation for individual ease and comfort, yet this would be certainly the result of Neo-Malthusianism. The benefits which he imagines would follow upon his idea being generally adopted have been over and over again proved to be fallacious, and moreover utterly destructive to all economic progress. It is hard to understand how the Neo-Malthusian can continue to advance his theories with honesty. Sir J. Crichton Browne writes most forcibly upon this point: "The altruistic emotions which in human beings, fostered and transmuted by various agencies, have enabled them, as regards certain relationships, to struggle out of the dismal swamp of the struggle for existence. And in the case of human beings it has, I believe, been the formation of distinct family groups that has more than any other reproductive influence been contributory to moral progress."

We may well wonder at a journal like *The Christian World* stating that abstinence from marriage is equivalent to the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. After a correspondence in its pages on Neo-Malthusianism, the issue of August, 1893, contained the following: "We limit population just as much by deferring marriage from prudential motives as by any action that may be taken after it." The two things are diametrically opposed to one another. To abstain from marriage for various reasons, especially under the present unjust economic system, is no sin, neither is mutual continence in the married, but to destroy or use means calculated to destroy the initiation of life in the married, Christian morality must pronounce to be immoral. Some who practise it stifle their conscience by saying that it is not directly condemned in Holy Scripture, but it is. A similar practice brought death to the man who adopted it, so it is recorded in the Book of Genesis. The desire for sexual intercourse and the instinct thereto have been implanted in all animal creation by the Creator for no other object but the repro-

duction of life, yet at the same time we are in no way commanded by Him to put them into action; "all things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." That instinct which we believe is divinely given, and to which pleasure has been attached to bring it into use, prompting every living thing to reproduce itself in the married and unmarried, may be kept under control, but when put into use should be allowed its lawful and legitimate mission. "The degradation of sexual instinct which Neo-Malthusianism brings about only seems to kill the family ideal, the sentiment of social duty, and to shake the very foundations of civilization and progress." (Nitti.) It is very difficult to imagine how those married under the Church's service and blessing can practice Neo-Malthusianism, for at the altar, in the most solemn and important moment of their lives, when they were joined together as man and wife by God's ordinance, never to be separated until it was God's will that death alone should do so, they were expressly told that marriage was ordained by Him for the procreation of children; "children to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord and praise of His Holy Name."

Professor Mivart says: "For my part I am profoundly convinced that no love is worthy of the name, or possesses any real value, unless it is consecrated by the idea of duty, which so frequently implies self-sacrifice; so consecrated, it is at once the source and stay of whatever is highest and noblest in life. Divorced from the idea of duty, it is the greatest curse of human existence, the cause of endless misery, and often deserving, in its base selfishness, to be called hatred rather than love."

There are many who believe that all the troubles which have fallen upon France are the punishments which have been inflicted upon that country for its gross violation of the fundamental laws of morality and human society. Certainly it has frustrated the intention of the Creator with regard to the moral obligations of marriage. Besides its immediate immorality, and the lack of child-life with all its advantage to the nation, Neo-Malthusianism, if largely carried out, would have another disastrous effect, and that Darwin clearly foresaw. It would very considerably diminish ante-nuptial chastity on the part of both men and women, especially of the latter. If they came to know that they could indulge all sexual appetite without any

fear of becoming mothers, they would undoubtedly surrender their virginity much more readily than if the fear of bearing a child was present.

"Sexuality would tend to increase if its responsibilities were annulled. The proportion of unchastity before marriage could hardly but be augmented." (*Evolution of Sex.*)

The fear of having a child, although not the highest moral preventative, certainly now restrains very many women from giving way, which otherwise they would be tempted to.

Another evil result of Neo-Malthusianism would be that divorce would become much more prevalent than is even the case at present. Whyte Melville showed us how the presence of children often averted that most disastrous rupture of marriage bonds, which serve so greatly as a protection for women, by the consideration of what would become of the children. But if Neo-Malthusianism should become generally adopted by society, this excellent preventative to divorce would certainly cease, inasmuch as no question of the children's future would be likely to arise. If Neo-Malthusianism should be largely adopted it most certainly would let loose an immense flood of pre-nuptial unchastity throughout all classes of society. Women would be enabled to appear outwardly as virgins, yet all the time they might be living in concubinage with their lovers, and nobody would be any the wiser. This is very much the case in Germany now. In consequence of the use of artificial checks to conception in France, there is a great prevalence of immorality amongst the class not wholly given over to vice. Concubinage without children is the rule in the town, marriage without children is that of the country. In case anybody wishes to know what actual effect the public adoption of Neo-Malthusianism would have on morality in general, let him read Göhre on its results in Germany, where it is now being widely adopted. He is a Lutheran pastor, who determined to live for a time amongst the working classes, to learn more intimately their manner of thought and modes of action. He tells us that in the large manufacturing centre of Chemnitz it would be almost impossible to find a single boy or girl over seventeen who is chaste.

Sexual intercourse without children is considered quite the natural course to adopt, and to marry and to have children to be the grossest folly a man and woman can commit. He gives us a graphic description of the manner in which people

who live under the influence of Neo-Malthusianism spend their Sunday evenings in the dancing saloons. Needless to say all are unbelievers. This is the animalism we English are advised to adopt by the advocates of Neo-Malthusianism, and such would most unquestionably be the case if their advice was widely adopted. Darwin was a far-seeing man, and he declared that such would be the case. It would be simple promiscuous intercourse without procreation of children. *Evolution of Sex* tells us plainly that Neo-Malthusianism would undoubtedly increase sexuality. It would transform human beings endowed with moral powers into mere machines for gross sexual gratification. But there is a moral force rising up against Neo-Malthusianism in many quarters of Europe. Will it prove the stronger? "Against all the efforts of the Neo-Malthusian school there has been formed, and is still forming, a strong current of opposition; doctors and demographers daily protest against a school, the principles of which, if carried into effect, would change matrimony into a monogamic prostitution, and would gradually lead to the weakening of social relations and to the degradation of the moral sentiments." (Nitti.) The French economist Guyau asserts that the question of the depopulation of France is purely and simply a matter of morality alone.

With regard to the question of morality in connection with the prevalence of Neo-Malthusianism in France, the census return of that country in the year 1891 gave no less than 7,684,906 Frenchmen as of no religion.

Caused by the miserable and unjust system of economics now in force, there are many influences at work against a high morality. Undue postponement of marriage is one. The advocate of the artificial check system avers that his scheme would remove this, but the case of France proves that it does not. The tendency of present society everywhere is against marriage and children. It is considered to be self-effacement and disappearance from what is considered living in the world; hence vice takes the place of purity of life, and we see the streets in the condition they are, and the whole moral state of the community deteriorating. Prostitution and disease are becoming more and more rampant every day, because a properly organized condition of marriage is lacking. We are now actually informed that no less than sixty per cent. of the population are more or less infected with syphilis;

some go so far as to say seventy-five per cent. "We now know that certain diseases of the lungs, liver and spleen are all of syphilitic origin, and the mortality from syphilis in its later forms is every year found to be larger and larger, by its being found to be the source of a number of diseases which previously were referred to other origins." (Sir J. Paget.) We also cannot forget what Ibsen wrote in *Ghosts*. "Of all diseases which can affect the human race, none is to be feared more than syphilis." (Duchatelet.) Competent medical authorities declare that this disease is rapidly spreading throughout all classes of society.

"Medical science mitigates suffering, but confers long life upon the diseased. Maladies arising from profligacy are controlled and half cured. The natural penalties of excess are remitted by the gratuitous skill of our hospital staff. Tens of thousands of individuals whose lives are diseased are preserved for marriage. These tainted constitutions transmit a terrible inheritance of evil to the next generation." (Arnold White.)

Society and the upper ten thousand think that social caste, its so-called privileges and pleasures, are to be esteemed of higher value than morality, but it shows a diseased state of mind. As the Rev. R. Blake says in *The Great Temptation*—"To be or not to be in society is not the question before God, but to be or not to be in Christ, in God's family, in God's love, in God's home." Granted that marriage and children, in the present artificial and unjust state of things, may be what is incorrectly termed social death; social life as commonly interpreted, being only feeding and amusing some indolent fellow-creatures who would be the first to desert one in time of trial, instead of one's own children, one's own flesh and blood. Surely we ought to consider the estimation of God to be of greater value than the estimation of an effete society. That is not in a healthy condition when it practically says, "Do anything, practise whatever vice you like, but do not marry and have children." The current phrase of society, alluding to young men who are not wealthy, or of the parents who cannot leave wealth to their sons, is, "Oh, he must make up his mind not to marry." In other words, he may wallow in vice in the streets and dens of the city; he may degrade himself and as many women as he likes; he may become rotten from disease, and infect others with the same

as much as he likes, but "he must make up his mind not to marry." Well, of course, it all means social asphyxia. It is only history repeating itself. Old civilizations, through giving countenance to such habits, became effete, effeminate, and rotten. England is rapidly sliding down the same plane. Prostitute yourselves, my sons; do the same, my daughters; only do not bring disgrace upon yourselves by unwelcome children. Pure marriage is a "clog and hindrance to all your hopes." Vice is far preferable to having children. This, be it observed, is only addressed to those who do not possess large means, hence the gross wickedness and injustice of it all. It tacitly declares that it will wink at woman's degradation, only be sure not to marry and have children. The poor suffering girl, who it insidiously declares is necessary for its sons' gratification, is cast into hell as a being too utterly degraded even to name; yet the men who cause her to be as she is are received with open arms into every drawing-room. Is this a proper, fit, and moral condition for society to be in? Is the immoral woman to be ostracised? Is the immoral man to be glorified? There are signs, however, that this unfair condition of things is about to cease. The fallen man will no doubt in time receive the same recompense as the fallen woman. The sooner the better, and then society will be reclaimed.

I do not propose to enter here into the advantages or disadvantages of the Contagious Diseases Acts, but there is a great deal of truth in the Declaration which the Ladies' National Association has lately issued. Here it is:—"The Contagious Diseases Acts, with every form of regulation of vice, whether established by law or existing only as an administrative measure sanctioned by the State, are an outrage against every principle of justice and just law. They are the public proclamation of outlawing against a class arbitrarily selected, not because of their own guilt, but for the convenience of their equally guilty accomplices. The enactment of the Contagious Diseases Acts was a fatal retrogression in English justice, introducing some of the worst features of American slavery, and sanctioning the immoral doctrine of the subjection of a portion of the human race as *corpora vilia* which may be sacrificed for the real or imaginary benefit of another portion." Why should men's sin in this respect be considered as nothing, but a woman's to be the cause of casting her outside all human pity? The women thus treated,

be it well remembered, are the daughters of the poor, not those of the rich. In places where we should least expect it we find Malthus' exploded idea still believed in—that the well-to-do are to marry and have children at their desire, but the poor are not to do so. For instance, we find a critic writing these words on Mr. Hobson's recent work, *The Problem of the Unemployed*: "It is the duty of the poor to abstain from bringing into the world children who will be additional competitors in a labour market already overstocked." If this is not adding another injustice to an already unbearable one, what is? Considering human nature as it is, it seemingly can only mean that the poor are to be condemned to wallow in vice and Neo-Malthusianism, while the rich are to be exempt from such evils; the sons of the poor man are to be depraved, and his daughters to be prostitutes. Is this a state of things that can last? Is it just? Is it in accordance with the simplest laws of humanity? And yet, after all they have had to bear in these respects, the morality of the poor is higher than that of the rich. Sad it is to have to say it, but it is beyond all question true, that all attempts to bring about a high condition of morality have come from the middle class, not from so-called English society. No attempt at self-reformation has ever been made by society—it has more or less defiantly accepted the reform when the middle class demanded it, but the reform itself has never originated within it. How absurd the Pharisaical hypocrisy of English society seems! It does all it can to prevent its sons making pure marriages and having healthy children, yet it bewails when it sees fit the increase of prostitution and the degradation of women. It is ready sometimes to give money, which costs them so little, towards girls' rescue and reformation, while it winks at their necessity. Father Ignatius, in the course of his usual plain speaking, observes that it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for the society mother of the day. One of the most terrible sights to be seen in the world at the present time is the condition of the West London streets at night. There can be seen woman's degradation in its most ghastly forms; there can be seen the result of hindrances to marriage; there can be seen the results of "he must make up his mind not to marry." There can be seen beautiful, handsome young Englishwomen of the finest types, born to give birth to splendid Englishmen,

yet sunk in vice and disease. Year by year, as those who are engaged in rescuing these girls know very well, their age is becoming younger and younger. Now we have to deal with mere children sometimes. Such is the result of the evil habits of modern society.

Neo-Malthusians do not of course take into any serious consideration the importance and blessings which the Old Testament attached to family life and children, but the Jewish race is a living witness to their beneficial and invigorating effects. It is far and away the healthiest race in the whole world; it is far less prone than others to infectious disease. Phthisis is of rare occurrence; during all the years the Royal Hospital for Consumption has existed, only six Jews have had occasion to enter it. The Jews seem to have more vitality and stamina than any others, and these qualities in addition to very superior mental calculating powers. They have fewer stillborn and illegitimate children than any other race, and far less suicides. Insanity is almost unknown amongst them. All these desirable qualifications arise from their acting within certain hygienic laws, known and appreciated ages ago, but which modern races have neglected to their serious loss. Amongst the Jews a family of children is extolled, a celibate condition is neither sanctioned or approved. From 1851 to 1864, the then estimated Roman Catholic population of Europe increased 0·48 per 100, the 52,212,000 Protestants 0·98, the Jews 1·93, and the same ratio continues. (See Lagneau.) The great fecundity of the Jews is in consequence of their religion, which abhors virginity; naturally every Jewish girl thinks that she may be the mother of the Messiah. "All Jewish heroes were men of numerous families and abundant offspring." Notwithstanding all the persecutions and troubles which it has had to endure for ages, and which would have stamped out others altogether, the Jewish race has increased and maintained itself in a marvellous manner, because it has always considered healthy, lawful marriage and family life to be the first duty of mankind, and which invariably tends to increase its vigour and contentment. (See Voltaire, *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, on this matter of the family life of the Jew.) I have taken some trouble to ascertain, and I find that the artificial check system is looked upon with horror by every Jew, both as distinctly immoral and also wholly ruinous to any nation that might be so foolish as to

adopt it. Neo-Malthusianism would most certainly cause such a nation to decay in numbers and become the victim of one more daring and prolific in numbers.

As it has ever been in the past, so it will be in the future. A nation going forth to conquer new lands in search of food, having obtained what it sought, settled down to enjoy its conquests. It soon allied itself by marriage to the women of the conquered, and imbibed the vices which caused the latter's overthrow. These in time caused the once conquering nation to give way in its turn to another more used to hardships and inured to self-denial. If it was the weaker types of the English race which artificial checks are now affecting, the result, though much to be deplored in consequence of their degrading effects, might not be so appalling, but it is not; it is the educated, the refined, the cultured, who are most generally putting them into use. The consequence, of course, is, that the weaker type is increasing and the stronger is declining. This is disastrous; is it wise, is it true political or economic wisdom, that a higher mental and physical type should decrease, one which has grown more and more perfect and refined through long centuries of environment, breeding, and chivalry? Is it wise, is it conducive to the welfare of the State, that such a type should wither and decay, and a lower one, weaker in discipline, in self-restraint, in all the higher virtues, increase? If such takes place, the best and choicest types will cease to be, and thus will come about the survival of the unfittest. Dewey says that it is mainly the working-men, the labourers for daily wages, who are now propagating the French race. Cournot says that the strongest, the most hard-working, the most provident, the most moral part of the population will have to struggle to maintain a parasitical population which is often lacking in these very qualities, and which it is very much to be feared will transmit a part of its hereditary vices to future generations. This is one of the inevitable results which will follow upon the highest types decreasing and the lower increasing.

Passy says that in those parts of Paris which are inhabited by the rich there are not 1·97 births to each marriage; in the poor the births amount to 2·86. Between the moderately rich and the very poor the difference is 1·87 to 3·24, that is 73 per cent. Cheysson says the birth-rate of the rich parts of Paris is 20 per 1000, of the poor 28. Nitti says that the

birth-rate of the quarter of the Louvre, the Bourse, and the Opera is hardly 22 per 1000, of Passy only 17, of the Champs Elysée only 16·4. But it is 30 per 1000 in Popincourt, Gobelins, Vaugirard, and Buttes Chaumont; in the very poorest parts 38 per 1000. The last French returns give the natality per 1000 of the following districts in Paris:—

Pere-Lachaise	39·1
Pont-de-Flandre	36·7
Gare d'Orleans	35·3
Javel	33·2
Maison-Blanche	32·7
La Chapelle	32·7
St. Thomas-d'Aquin	14·4
Chauss-d'Antin	14·4
Place Vendôme	14·0
Invalides	13·7
Madeleine	12·9
Porte-Dauphine	10·3

In the last census of Paris there were found an enormous number of couples with no children in the neighbourhood of the Place Vendôme; on the other hand, in the Epinettes there were found more families with four children than those with none. The department of the Seine Inférieure has a very high birth-rate, but Cherwin says that forty-seven out of every hundred recruits coming from it have to be rejected. Rümelin, observing that the rich are provident, and the wage-earners improvident and boundlessly prolific, asks, in dismay, if this singular fact, which renders the intelligent classes stationary and the uncultured more numerous, is not an inversion of Darwinian selection?

It is very ominous that the birth-rate of the East End of London amounts to 35 per 1000, that of the West to only 25. *The Malthusian* tells us that the birth-rate in Hampstead amounts to only 20 per 1000, that of Whitechapel to 40. When power, either mental or physical, has decreased in a race, it is best for all concerned that that race should not increase.

There is another very gigantic evil, easily discernible in the practice of Neo-Malthusianism, which it would be well for its advocates to gravely consider. It is that if the nations of the West were generally to adopt it, they would infallibly decrease in numbers, and those of the East would take their

places. Yves Guyot says that if Neo-Malthusianism, which is destroying the French people, should extend to the other races which now form the front rank of civilization, they will run the risk some day of being supplanted by the less civilized peoples. Whole nations will share the fate which has already befallen the enfeebled and degenerate descendants of our aristocracy and wealthy bourgeoisie. Orientals rightly consider that population is strength, and now that famines are more under control, in consequence of improved organization, wars likely to cease, at least in India, and infanticide dying out, their numbers are rapidly increasing. Is it to be the case that, in consequence of European nations giving way to immorality, these nations will pour in in multitudes upon the effete and dwindling races of the West? This would not seem impossible if Neo-Malthusianism was allowed to pursue its way unchecked; Pearson's prophecies that the yellow race will one day sweep in upon the West would then be fulfilled.

Jules Simon bids us beware of what the East will do in the future. "Everything in the East is asleep, nothing is dead; be on your guard against the awakening. After long resistance it has now condescended to use the weapons acquired from us. China has only to open her ports to become formidable at a stroke. Beware. The history of Europe is now and must be for a long time the history of Asia and Africa." Again another statesman, thoroughly conversant with Oriental manners and customs, writes:—

"The coming century, which will be full of scientific marvels, radically changing the conditions of modern life, will also see the awakening of old-world nations, which many have believed to have sunk into hopeless decrepitude. Everywhere the valley of dry bones begins to stir with new life." (Sir Lepel Griffin in *Nineteenth Century*, July, 1896.)

In 1883 the population of Japan amounted to 37,017,302; in 1893 to 41,388,313. The birth-rate of Madras is the highest of cities in the world, amounting to 40·7 per 1000; Christiania is the lowest, only 17·6. (Whitaker.) Ibsen says Christiania is the most immoral town in Europe. Marriage is practically non-existent, owing to the absence of police-controlled prostitution and the great facility for divorce. He says the streets are singularly clean of all vice, but the private houses, the family circles, are singularly impure. The *ménage*

à trois flourishes there as nowhere else. People marry, divorce, re-marry, and after re-marriage return to a kind of free union. He also says that since the abolition of Government inspection of women, syphilis has enormously increased. Next to Stockholm, there is more of that disease in Christiania than in any other town in Europe. We can therefore easily learn from all this why Christiania has the lowest birth-rate of all cities in the world. In 1816 the population of Java amounted to 4,615,000; in 1889 to 22,818,000.

"If a superior race increases and multiplies civilization is safe, if an inferior all is in peril; to run such a risk voluntarily is ruin to all concerned. Civilization could not run such a risk. If science has demonstrated that the superior races are the least prolific, to voluntarily help in intensifying the phenomenon is to unconsciously prepare the decay of civilization, the brutalizing of the world." (Nitti.) Galton says "that in the old-standing civilization the active and ambitious classes are induced by many reasons to defer the age of matrimony, and many marriages are dictated by economic motives. Hence there is in old nations a permanent obstacle to the fecundity of the more elevated classes, so that only the weak and improvident are very prolific. Thus the race gradually deteriorates, preserving the appearances of civilization until it reverts to barbarism." This is certainly the danger ahead now, not only in England, but throughout all Europe. The best and most fitted types to increase are ceasing to do so; the least fitted very much the reverse.

"A recognition of the obligations which man owes to his fellow-men, and the promptings of love's divine self-abnegation, impose restraints on some of the competitors, who, instead of forcing their way to the front, as they are well able to do, stand aside and allow themselves to be beaten by those less fitted to survive." (Crichton Browne.)

Amongst all uncivilized nations the birth-rate is enormously high. For instance, the negroes of the United States have a much higher natality than the whites. This is due to their low social condition and general improvidence. For whites the figures are 26.35 per 1000; for the coloured, 29.07. See Mayo Smith on this point. He regrets that the fecundity of the coloured is greater than that of the white races, and predicts trouble in future from it.

But in considering the natality of coloured races, it must be

remembered that their death-rate is correspondingly high ; for instance, the death-rate of infants under one year amounted in Calcutta, in 1893, to 415 per 1000 ; in 1894, to 403. In England the corresponding annual rate was, over an average of ten years, but 144.

In 1790 the population of the United States amounted to 3,929,214 ; in 1890, to 67,240,000. In 1790 the coloured population amounted to 757,208 ; in 1890, to 8,000,000. The American statisticians estimate, present increase continuing, that in 1900 the white population of the United States will amount to 77,000,000 ; in 1950 to 103,314,000 ; in 1990 to 1,206,400,000, with a coloured population in that year of 86,000,000. They also estimate that in 1990 the urban population of the United States will amount to 240,000,000, and of these New York alone will probably contain 30,000,000.

In India the birth-rate now amounts to 48 per 1000. This is greater than in any country of Europe except Russia. There is ample room for imagination, therefore, as to what the future will bring with regard to Eastern populations ; the only European one which is largely increasing and keeping pace with them is the Slavonic. Is that to be the dominating power of the world after the Latin, the Teutonic, and the Anglo-Saxon have faded and gone ? Russia certainly plays the chief part in Europe now, and she shows signs that she will soon do the same in Asia. She evinces a greater aptitude in assimilating herself with the manners and customs of the Oriental than any other Western nation. To the Englishman the Indian is always the nigger ; the Russian does not disdain to incorporate the nigger with himself, and so the two nations become blended into each other. The Indian respects the Englishman : to him he owes all the law and justice he enjoys, but his heart is far from him ; his ideas, his character, his manners, form things apart. With the Russian it is entirely different. The latter is half an Oriental himself, and he has no difficulty in making himself loved by the races he overthrows.

Naturalists scoff at any importance being placed on the quantity of population ; that its quality must always be the chief consideration, and that the future cannot be for the most populous, but for the most individuated races. Granted. But naturalists must remember that cessation of famine, increased sanitary knowledge and culture, better food, etc., are

rapidly bringing Oriental races, enormous in numbers, quite on a par with the so-called civilization of the West, and when this completely comes to pass, numbers must tell. Given equal appliances, equal knowledge, equal conditions, and then it must be readily admitted that numbers will win. Of course, if all races were on a par, so far as civilization is concerned, it would not matter much whether black or white humanity ruled the world, but the former, so far as history and knowledge of it inform us, seems incapable of rising to the highest level.

The condition of Hayti and Liberia, as well as some States in the East, are sufficient examples of this. As yet the attention of the West has not been sufficiently aroused to the astounding development of the Japanese. In some respects they are already far superior to Western nations; they after a thirty years' experience of improvement, we after many, many centuries of the same. And it must be remembered that the Chinese are just as capable of development as the Japanese. The only difference at present existing between them is that one has adopted Western civilization, improvements, and discoveries, while the other has not. One day the Chinese will most assuredly wake up, and then those who are alive will see what numbers can do under equal conditions. Pearson's prophecies have just as much force now as ever they had; rather more, in consequence of what Japan has shown herself capable of. The ill-success of the Chinese in the late war was solely caused by an absurd, rotten, governmental system rather than by any want of vigour in the nation itself. What it did under Gordon is quite sufficient to amply prove that when well governed, well led, and equipped, the Chinese soldier is as effective as any European one. Only the other day Lord Wolseley publicly stated that the Chinese were above most races apparently designed to be a great military, naval, and conquering people. They possessed all the important attributes that enabled men to be easily and quickly converted into excellent soldiers and sailors. He had no hesitation in saying that, given a free hand and allowed at first to draw upon England for officers and military instructors, he would guarantee to raise, in a couple of years, a great Chinese army which it would be hard indeed to beat. There was certainly nothing in the East which could beat it. The whole cause of the defeat of China in the late

war was that for centuries Chinese laws and customs had killed all military spirit. These, combined with degeneracy within, had united in temporarily overcoming that nation.

At present, as Mr. Gladstone tells us, the Christian nations rule the world. This no doubt is true, but unless Paganism breaks up before Christianity sooner than is expected, the rise of Japan is a proof that it will not always be so, and when China awakes it most certainly will not be. Gaskell, in his letter to Darwin, admitted that "there is undoubtedly one great danger in lessened fertility of some races, namely, that the pressure of other races upon them might extinguish them." Neo-Malthusians ought, before they urge their system on the multitude, to consider fully this most important result of the course of action which they are so eager to recommend. We shall see, when we come to deal with the case of France, how it shows itself there. Notwithstanding all that can be urged against the immorality of making use of artificial checks, some of which I have commented on, I am well aware that there are many high-minded, refined men of the highest moral order and standard of ethics who cannot see their way to the absolute moral condemnation of some at least of these practices. It is very difficult, they affirm, to prove them to be in themselves morally wrong, and that their chief condemnation ought to lie in their disastrous social political results, and in their physical consequences. It seems to me that the moral aspect of the matter has to be considered from the point of view of our responsibility to our Creator and His revealed will on the matter. What I am about to write will, of course, have no weight with unbelievers, but Christians must believe in the duties and responsibilities to God and man which are annexed to the creation of a human life. It becomes a nice question to affirm, as Lea says, at what particular point violation of its sacredness commences. It is a question of degree and time. It is the difference between destroying the potentiality of life and life itself. The latter, of course, is infanticide or murder; the former is moral murder. The desire of the will is the same in both cases.

The doctrines of Traducianism and Creationism may be considered with profit here. The former means in simple words that the soul as well as body is begotten by reproduction from the substance of the parent; the latter that the soul is separately created by God, and not as the body, engendered

by reproduction from the substance of the parent. The latter is the most generally accepted. Certainly one thing must be clear to the Christian, that Neo-Malthusianism is a frustration of God's moral government and care for each human life, which He has given man and wife the power to bring into the world. Moreover, it is especially a sin against the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of Life. It ranks higher in the scale of turpitude than self-abuse, for in the latter one individual only sins while in Neo-Malthusianism two become partners in each other's sins. Moreover, the whole Church condemns it, and that must be sufficient for the Churchman. Professor Mivart says that to those who frustrate the ends of matrimony the Church absolutely denies all use of her Sacraments. It is utterly impossible for any Neo-Malthusian to be a communicant. He also adds that the depopulation of France "is due to the gradual decay of Christian belief there, with the consequent progressive disappearance of Christian morality. Amongst Catholic families, faithful to their religious duties, such evils could not exist. In England, where there is now a great decay, as well as much progress in religion, we have begun to experience a corresponding moral relaxation which is greatly facilitated by the knowledge, now widely diffused amongst women, of these proceedings. Anyone who, wholly advocating license, promotes this unadulterated selfishness in undenyng self-gratification, or who seeks to relax the binding force of those matrimonial obligations still happily recognized amongst us, directly attacks the welfare of the State, and does his best, however unwillingly, to destroy the nation's very life."

Schöne says that, besides luxury and prostitution, the depopulation of France is to be attributed to the decay of all religion more than anything else. (See *L'Irreligion de l'Avenir*, Guyau.)

And now we have to discuss another aspect of the matter, which, although it does not bear directly on the subject we have in hand, is closely allied to it. Numbers of zealous and well-educated women are rising up in the present day, who, although they would scorn to make use of artificial checks, absolutely refuse to accept the duties and responsibilities of maternity. The simplest course, it would seem to the most superficial observer, for them to adopt would be to remain single; but this they repudiate altogether as a condition not suitable for a woman. They desire to be wives,

but not mothers. They implore their husbands not to inflict upon them what they consider the degradation of having a child. They say that they have to bear all the pains and penalties of childbirth and have all the trouble attendant upon nursing the child, therefore they alone ought to be the arbiters of their fate, and to them alone should be given the choice of deciding when or at all the burden should be undergone. A certain writer in the *Humanitarian* voices this present feeling of advanced women-thinkers in the number of that Magazine for February, 1894, in the following words:—"I protest against this form of slavery; I protest against the custom which compels women to give the control of their maternal functions over to anybody. It should be theirs to determine when and in what circumstances the greatest of all constructive processes, the formation of an immortal soul, should be begun. It is a fearful responsibility with which women are entrusted by nature, and the very last thing that they should be compelled to do is to perform the office of that responsibility against their will, under improper conditions, or by disgusting means." We read in many writings, women's especially, of the present revolt against sex obligations by women. It is everywhere visible. "The extreme popularity of such works as *The Heavenly Twins*, and *Jude the Obscure*, can be primarily attributed to the fact that these writers do but give audible expression to the silent rebellion of innumerable women. That woman should have the free ordering of her life, that all questions as to the regulation of her motherhood should be left in her own hands, seems on the face of it no more than any capable, self-respecting citizen might rightfully expect." (The Hon. Miss Alice Coralie Glyn, in *The Humanitarian* for December, 1896.) The ladies who now write these books on sex matters tell us of the many letters which they receive from women in all parts of the world thanking them most cordially for what they have written. In every European country this revolt of all classes of women against maternity is becoming apparent. Guyau writes: "Même chez les femmes du peuple la gestation et l'accouchement étant le plus dur travail est aussi celui qui est l'object de la plus vive répulsion et des protestations de toute sorte. Je n'ai pas vu une femme du peuple qui ne se lamentât d'être enciente, qui ne préférât même toute autre maladie à cette maladie de neuf mois. 'Ah, nous ne faisons pas, nous recevons,'

me disait l'une d'elles, 'sans cela.'—Elle résumait ainsi la situation physiologique et psychologique de la femme pauvre. Celle qui n'ont pas eu d'enfants loin de s'en plaindre s'estiment le plus souvent très heureuses. En tout cas, elles n'en désirent presque jamais plus d'un." Baudrillart writes: "En Picardie et en Normandie on se moque de la femme qui a beaucoup d'enfants. Ce qui sauve la fécondité de la femme dans les autres provinces, a défilant de la religion, c'est son ignorance. Elle ne connaît pas toujours Malthus. Elle ne trouve qu'un remède au mal qu'elle redoute; fuir son mari. Telle femme d'ouvrier préfère être battue que risquer d'avoir un nouvel enfant; mais, comme elle est plus faible, elle recoit souvent presque à la fois les coups et l'enfant. La crainte de l'enfant est plus fréquemment qu'on ne croit une cause de dissensions dans les ménages pauvres, comme d'ailleurs dans les ménages riches. Du moment où la femme raisonne au lieu de se laisser guider par la foi, elle ne peut pas manquer de sentir la très grande disproportion qui existe pour elle entre les joies de l'amour et les souffrances de la maternité. Il faudrait qu'une nouvelle idée intervint ici, celle du devoir, et non pas seulement d'une obligation religieuse, dont le mari peut se railler, mais d'une obligation morale."

All this is a serious question, and is, judging from certain widely-read novels of the day, coming rapidly to the front as one of our most serious social questions. What will be the end thereof? Is a wife ever morally justified in refusing to beget another's life? Under these circumstances she is. If hurt to herself or her child be probable; if her husband be suffering from venereal disease; if she cannot have but still-born children; if he be drunk, or a confirmed dipsomaniac; if he be insane; if he be unfaithful. That book, *Der Kampf der Geschlechter, eine Studie aus dem Leben und für das Leben*, may be read with profit in this connection. That there are cases innumerable in which wives need protection from their husbands, there can be no doubt whatever, and the time seems approaching when women will justly demand and obtain such protection. When an attempt was made to render the sale of Mrs. Besant's work on *Population* in Australia illegal, Mr. Justice Windmeyer refused to condemn it, and made some remarks upon the disastrous effects which the exercise of unjust though legal marital rights can have upon an unfortunate wife and society in general. He commented upon

the case of a woman, married to a drunken husband, steadily ruining his constitution, ruining his family, bringing children into the world to be inevitably depraved like himself, who is obliged, although loathing it, to submit to her husband. This is, of course, an injustice to the wife, and needs amendment. But where such evil surroundings are absent, and where moral conditions to lawful sexual intercourse prevail, it is difficult to see why they should not be exercised. In *The Woman Who Did*, Grant Allen says: "Every good woman is by nature a mother, and finds best in maternity her social and moral salvation. She shall be saved by the child-bearing. Herminia was far removed indeed from that blatant and decadent sect of 'advanced women' who talk as though motherhood were a disgrace and a burden, instead of being, as it is, the full realization of woman's faculties, the natural outlet for woman's wealth of emotion. She knew that to be a mother is the best privilege of her sex, a privilege of which unholy, man-made institutions now conspire to deprive half the finest and noblest women in our civilized communities."

Marriage must ever mean to a woman that she is expected to bear her husband children; if she accepts an offer of marriage it ought surely to imply that she gives her consent to fulfil that condition which has hitherto been annexed to it, and which every man, as long as his conduct is irreproachable, has a right to expect. It is impossible for human nature, the wit of man, or morality, to discover any other solution of the present revolt of women, than for those who would be likely to feel the duties of maternity irksome to refrain from marriage. If they consent to marry they give their acquiescence to perform their part of the contract.

Lady Henry Somerset deals with the question in *The Arena* for March, 1895, under an article termed "The Welcome Child." In it she enlarges upon the disadvantages of an unwelcome child, and that the millennium will only set in when every child is welcome. By a child's being welcome, she means of course only welcome to the mother; the father's wishes on the subject are not to be considered as of any account. She says: "Let us remember the number of children that are at this moment awakening into this world whose mothers greet them with a sigh, and hold out their arms to take them with a sob instead of a kiss, wishing that the little baby face turned up to theirs had never seen

the light; yet they crowd in, these little unwelcome strangers, upon the weary workers of the world; the women who bend over their tasks until they lie down under the great agony of maternity, and know that when it is over, weak and wan, they must take up their labour again, with another mouth to feed, and less strength to gain the wherewithal. Through those dreary months before the final tragedy, that child has been environed with the consciousness that it was not wanted; gloomy anticipation has robbed the little one of joy and hope, and so once more a being comes into existence with a life blighted, a nature narrowed and cramped, affections chilled, before it has seen the sun in the heavens or drawn the breath of life. And this happens not only in the garret and cellar, but in homes of opulence and ease. The unwritten tragedy of woman's life is there."

This is picturesque though sorrowful writing, and not fair argument. If Lady Henry Somerset could only be brought to see that a child can only be unwelcome as long as man continues to make, in his folly and selfishness, the conditions of life adverse and unjust, and that it is a God-given instinct in a woman to be a mother, and that human life is a divine gift, it would be better for her and those she attempts to teach. Doubtless she has no intention to do so, but her inferences here tend directly to the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. It would be of more advantage to herself and all concerned if she would appeal to the rich for greater simplicity of life, more Christian charity to the poor, and strive to inaugurate a more equitable distribution of wealth than now prevails. Then there would be no unwelcome children, then no mother would sigh and sob when she gazed on her newborn child. Lady Henry Somerset, like many others, attempts to deal with results instead of causes. She should learn that it is in consequence of landlords and capitalists getting more than their just share of the general production of the nation that "mothers wish that the little baby faces turned up to theirs had never seen the light," and that the vice about which she speaks to the country would die out if all impediments to proper marriage were removed. If she tried to do this she would be doing better work for her poor suffering sisters than she does now. The evils which are now shattering morality and society do not necessarily come into force; they always arise from the injustice of human laws and institutions.

She describes, in her article, a condition of things which doubtless exists in far too large a number of families now, but she does not attempt to point out either the causes or the remedies; all she remarks is that children are unwelcome, owing to an untoward condition of economics. In this she is merely a disciple of Malthus.

But many of those women who hold advanced views on feminine matters do not agree with this doctrine of wives refusing to bear children. Virginie Demont-Breton, the great French painter, says: "Maternity is the most beautiful, the healthiest glory of woman; it is a love dream in palpable form, and comes smilingly to demand our tenderness and our kisses; it is the inexhaustible source whence feminine art draws its purest inspirations."

Sarah Grand says: "While being fully in favour of women entering the professions, speaking on public platforms, and taking their part in the movements of the time, I think they should always consider their homes and families first of all. There is no more delicate or beautiful work than training and developing the minds of little children, and I have no respect for women who do not feel this to be an important work. The influence of a mother is paramount, and I do not think that a woman can be better engaged than in her own nursery."

These are the remarks of a wise woman, and it would be well if they were taken to heart by many of her sex.

This matter of the revolt against maternity is deserving of very serious consideration, whether carried out by Neo-Malthusianism or as a simple refusal to bear children, for this has always hitherto been considered to be the moral duty of a wife. Formerly it was considered that men were much more selfish than women, but, judging from the signs of the times, women are gaining upon them fast. The virtue of self-sacrifice for others has come to be looked upon as mere foolishness. Faith and religion are fast losing their hold, life is considered to be but an opportunity for hedonism, an end in itself; the consequence is that women are fast repudiating the self-sacrifice required for the birth of children. But Sir J. Browne writes: "The triumph of motherhood represents the immolation of the individual for the collective advantage. Throughout the whole animal kingdom, from the mesozoa, where the female dies in giving birth to her ova, upwards, we

have illustrations of the sacrificial nature of the reproductive process."

The whole matter has been admirably treated by Professor Mivart in *The Humanitarian* for October, 1896. He deals with it, as might be expected, in a masterly manner. He says it has a special bearing on the well-being of society, since it may result in the extinction of some choice specimens of our race. This remark can be equally applied to Neo-Malthusianism, and I have touched upon it before. He declares, which will be very unwelcome reading to those ladies who repudiate maternity, that the natural and normal end of marriage is the production of children, and he finishes his remarks with a direct statement, which must find a place in my argument.

"Though the full enjoyment of conjugal delights is utterly devoid of the merest shadow of blame, still there is a higher ideal for those who would attain a stage of development most remote from mere animality; it is scrupulously to fulfil the duties of the faithful spouse and tender mother, as purely and exclusively from a will and intention to be as lovingly faithful to duty as may be possible. But unless the husband and wife have mutually agreed from the first to live together in absolute chastity, it is evident that the main end of marriage renders submission to intimate conjugal relations an obvious duty on the part of the woman. It is plainly, also, but justice to the husband, who otherwise may incur too serious a disadvantage. By submission, then, the wife yields to the injunctions of reason and justice, and conforms to the moral law. If such submission is distasteful, her compliance acquires increased merit of self-sacrifice to duty. She subordinates feeling to the intellectual perception of right, and so obeys the dictates of the highest powers her being possesses. In thus acting, her very feelings of reluctance may become a source of merit, and she will so attain to a higher moral elevation. How, then, by such acts, is degradation possible? It is by the opposite course, by the subordination of reason to sentiment, and of plain duty to mere feeling, that through the desire to escape an imaginary and unreal inferiority, there may be brought about grave social mischief, and, what indeed has in some instances already occurred, namely, a real and most disastrous degradation of woman." He also adds, "that any race amidst whom the instinct of reproduction has fallen into abeyance must be far on the high road to extinction."

The remark which the Professor makes upon the serious disadvantage thrown upon the husband, by the refusal of the wife to undergo conjugal relations, is well timed. Does the thought ever strike such women that they are likely thereby to drive their husbands into vice, and would therefore be the direct causes of their husbands' sin? This is a supremely important aspect of the matter, which it would be most desirable for women who advance these doctrines to consider. They should remember that marriage has been ordained as a remedy against vice, but their course of conduct would render it useless for the very purpose for which it was ordained. In fact, the tables would be turned, and they would be the direct means of degrading their husbands.

The end of the nineteenth century will prove the parting of many ways. Unless we all hold fast to the sacred ties and duties of marriage and family life, society in the near future will certainly and surely be wrecked. If all these hindrances to marriage continue to become more powerful; if men, seeing women refuse to bear children, shrink back from marriage, and give themselves over to prostitution, we may well wonder what the future of civilization will be. We are living in a time when everything is being questioned. What have hitherto been accepted as moral truths, about whose certainty there was not a possibility of doubt, are now attacked and jeered at even by boys and girls in their teens. Of course the consequence is that faith and morality are disappearing; there is no longer any honesty, any morality, any chivalry. The struggle for life has become so keen that honest and moral dealings are rapidly becoming unknown quantities.

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM WITH REGARD TO POPULATION

WE shall commence the consideration of this part of our subject with that axiom of Political Science kept continually in our remembrance that "Population is strength." This must surely be admitted by the Neo-Malthusian to be a positive truth. History and the experience of the world have proved it to be so over and over again. I have touched lightly upon this point in previous pages, when we were dealing with Malthus, but we shall enter into it more fully later on in the course of this argument. I am quite ready to admit that a weakened, disordered, and degenerate population cannot be a source of strength, but rather the contrary. Owing to a disastrous combination of hostile forces, we seem to be approaching a condition of things, with regard to the population of England, which will soon need the utmost energy of statesmen and philanthropists to cope with. The fittest type to live and work is declining, and herds of the unfit, with bolstered-up lives, are rising up to take its place. The man of the country, healthy and strong, is being rapidly transformed into the man of the town, diseased and weak. The countryside is sacrificing its most stalwart sons and daughters to the Molochs of the factory and the town, with the inevitable result that the health of the nation is deteriorating. From every quarter pour in upon our ears harrowing tales of the misery of the poor in our large towns and cities. Various causes contribute to create this misery, the chief of which are unjust distribution of wealth, the multiplication of the unfit, and over-population.

With regard to the first, there can be no doubt whatever but that increase of population also means increase of wealth. "The countries of densest populations are always those of the greatest wealth." What we are suffering from now in

these respects is caused by a reckless and indiscreet increase of population, which, being unable to obtain a due share of the wealth it produces, lacks proper food, and all that tends to make life satisfactory. Hence great disorder among all classes, and continual strikes between capital and labour. Capital must remember that it is useless without labour, and labour must also recollect that it is useless and unprofitable without capital. When the interests of the two become combined, and the profits arising from the union of both are more equally divided, the mystery will be solved; and in the principle of profit-sharing we may discover one step towards the solution.

I must not enter too deeply into the reasons why wealth has a tendency to increase faster than population. It will be sufficient for the purposes of this book merely to state the fact, giving some evidence to corroborate this statement.

It is beyond all doubt that it does so. The fault lies in the fact that the majority of producers, population in the full sense of the word, do not receive their proper share, and so we have reached a condition of things where wealth is increasing on the one side, and poverty on the other.

"Although there is not a greater population than that required by the wealth which is being accumulated, there is, however, a very bad distribution of work, which weighs heavily upon the one class while keeping the other unoccupied. In this way one part of the population performs the work which all should do, and capitalism avails itself of the industrial reserve, that is of the great body of the unemployed, to compel those who work to accept a slender salary." (Nitti.) Hence has arisen most, if not all, of our present-day troubles. Men are obliged to take what wages are grudgingly doled out or starve. Formerly it was possible for a small trader to earn a competence; now it is impossible, for all trade is passing from individual power of acquisition into that of large syndicates and companies. Even so long ago as the year 1880, Cardinal Manning wrote: "In no country, and in no age, has the world ever yet seen such commercial activity and prosperity as that of England. But in the midst of immeasurable wealth is a want which the poorest country of Europe scarcely knows. The inequalities of our social state, the chasms which separate classes, and the abrupt and harsh

contrasts of soft and suffering lots, unless they be redressed by humility and charity, sympathy and self-denial, are dangerous to society and to our spiritual welfare."

I hope to deal with the matter of the multiplication of the unfit under marriage. Let us deal here with the increase of wealth as regards population and distribution. The estimates of public wealth, by the most experienced economists, show that the capital of the United Kingdom has doubled in forty years :—

ESTIMATES.				WEALTH OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.
1800.	Beck and Pulteney	.	.	1,800,000,000
1840.	Porter	.	.	4,000,000,000
1860.	Levi	.	.	6,000,000,000
1877.	Giffen	.	.	8,840,000,000

(Mulhall.)

THE GROWTH OF POPULATION AND WEALTH OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM IS AS FOLLOWS.

YEAR.	POPULATION IN MILLIONS.	NATIONAL WEALTH IN MILLIONS.	PROPORTION TO EACH INDIVIDUAL.
1600 . .	4½	£100	£22
1887 . .	37	£10,000	£270

PROPORTION BETWEEN WEALTH AND POPULATION IN
FRANCE.

YEAR.	POPULATION IN MILLIONS.	NATIONAL WEALTH IN MILLIONS.	PROPORTION TO EACH INDIVIDUAL.
1789 . .	26	£1,520	£58
1885 . .	38	£8,560	£225

PROPORTION BETWEEN WEALTH AND POPULATION OF THE
UNITED STATES.

YEAR.	POPULATION.	AVERAGE DOLLARS PER HEAD.
1790 . .	3,929,827	187.00
1800 . .	5,305,937	202.13
1810 . .	7,239,814	207.20
1820 . .	9,638,191	195.00
1830 . .	12,866,020	206.00
1840 . .	17,069,453	220.00
1850 . .	23,191,876	307.67
1860 . .	31,500,000	510.00
1870 . .	38,558,000	776.96
1880 . .	—	870.00
1890 . .	62,622,250	1000.00

The total expenditure of the United Kingdom in the year 1875 was under eighty millions, in the year 1895 it amounted to one hundred millions. Over and over again it has been amply and sufficiently proved that increase of population has always been followed by increase of trade. See Giffen's *Growth of Capital*, and "The Statement of the Malthusian Principle" in *Macmillan's Magazine* for December, 1883. In the year 1801 the exports and imports per head of the population of the United Kingdom amounted to £7 10s., in 1895 to £18. In 1801 British imports and exports amounted in value to £212,000,000, in 1896 to £681,729,544. The following figures show the imports and exports of the United Kingdom, and their value per head, for forty years:—

IMPORTS.					PER HEAD.		
YEAR.			VALUE IN MILLIONS.		£	s.	d.
1854	.	.	152	...	5	10	2
1895	.	.	417	...	10	19	7

EXPORTS.					PER HEAD.		
YEAR.			VALUE IN MILLIONS.		£	s.	d.
1854	.	.	97	...	3	10	2
1895	.	.	286	...	6	2	11

In the year 1801 the total tonnage of the British Mercantile Marine amounted to 2,812,000, in 1895 to 12,969,951. Professor Symes stated at the Manchester Church Congress of 1888 that the tendency in England has always been for wealth to increase much more rapidly than population. Wealth had quadrupled, but population had only doubled. He added that if landlords and employers of labour got more than their fair share, which is obviously the case, the rate of wages would inevitably fall, and this we see taking place everywhere. Nitti goes into the statistics of the matter, and shows us that in France wealth far exceeds the population, yet there is still in that country the most squalid poverty, and just as many unemployed as here. Poverty and misery, then, it may with safety be said, are not always the results of an excess of population, but of a vitiated system of distribution of wealth. In his great work, *Principles of Economics*, Marshall goes into this question of the mutual increase of wealth and population, and shows us how numbers and wealth may increase with equal profit to both, and how dangerous any decrease would be. The privation and poverty we see around us now are not

wholly caused by an excess of population—they are the inevitable consequences of an unrighteous and unjust economic system which has silently grown up, and been borne without sufficient protest far too long. “Hitherto humanity has always acted in ignorance of its proper laws, and hence unconsciously with regard to production, distribution, and population. In the new society which is to be it will go forward with full consciousness of those laws and rules.” (Bebel.) Various remedies have been and are being propounded to bring about a more satisfactory condition of things than, alas! now exists—some of them very wild and impracticable. All the best suggestions which have been put forward by those most competent to offer an opinion upon the matter tend towards the direction of checking the accumulation of wealth by the individual, who, generally speaking, acts regardless of the wants and miseries of others. We ought to do everything in our power to reduce the inequalities of wealth; this is the true goal for every worker in the social field to have in view. To remove everything which would tend to hinder increase of production, especially from the land; to carefully promote a wise increase of a proper population; to do all in our utmost power to increase wealth, and then see that it is fairly distributed amongst all those who have contributed their share towards its production;—that will be the ideal state. When will it come? When will that blessed time arrive when men, women, and children, instead of cutting each other’s throats to still further enrich the wealthy, will be working together for themselves, and for everybody who will stand side by side with them in the community which is to be? The Neo-Malthusians put forward their crude theories to meet the present difficulties, and short-sighted people eagerly adopt them, sincerely believing that they will prove a solution and a short cut to happiness. Uneducated people do not stay to inquire what Political Economy has to say upon the points at issue. We ought not to work towards diminishing a properly regulated population; we should endeavour to remove every obstacle which stands in the way of the population obtaining its fair share of the general production. We ought to do our utmost to increase wealth, and distribute it justly amongst the largest number; this is what the Bradlaugh school could not be got to see or understand. The tendency nowadays in dealing with the accumulation of wealth is to extinguish the

single capitalist, and to form large syndicates, corporations, and companies, to acquire and hold it in trust for others. These companies cannot, it is alleged, have any consciences, so far as justice to others is concerned, as what they hold is given them to trade with, and pay good dividends to those who have entrusted capital to them. It is true that vast numbers of poor working people have all their possessions in these companies—possessions which would be unproductive unless they had such things to place them in. Quite so, but all this does not relieve the investor from exercising that most excellent gift of charity out of the dividends which he receives. Besides, a large number of these investors are drones and idlers, who stand all the day idle, and produce nothing for the advantage of the common weal. They live in luxury on the toil and sweat of others. The burthen of doing some good to his fellow-creatures rests on the conscience of each individual, and he is bound to make an adequate return to those who by their labour have contributed to his wealth. In too many cases by far nothing of this is done. For instance, a very large number of Christian people, living in great luxury in England, derive the money which enables them to do this from investments in our colonies. But what do they give to the colonies in return? What do they expend in providing our colonists with the spiritual privileges which they are so sorely in need of, and which the investors in Colonial Securities have in such lavish profusion at their own doors at home? In far too many cases nothing at all.

The personal responsibility of wealth is now being brought home to the minds of the English people much more than it has ever been before, and there is in this great hope for the future. The Church is pressing home to each individual conscience that the possession of wealth is a great responsibility and trust, and if a future life is believed in, so surely an account will have to be rendered of the manner in which it has been administered here. Besides, all laws dealing with the personal possession of property have undergone great modifications of late years; it is a mere impertinence to say that a man can do what he likes with his own; so far as wealth is concerned he cannot legally do anything which interferes with his neighbour's comfort or interests. Some ardent reformers urge the adoption of a graduated taxation of the well-to-do by means of a progressive income-tax; they say

it would be fair to all, both rich and poor, for all would contribute their just quota to whatever alleviation of misery the proceeds might be apportioned. "A progressive income-tax might possibly meet the case. This would throw a much larger burden of the taxes upon the wealthy than they have hitherto borne." (Minton.) The principle of a progressive taxation has been admitted long ago. What are Poor, School Board, Sanitary, Public Library Acts but the exercise of this principle? The poor, no doubt, are enormously benefited in many ways by them. We have made great strides. Since the principle was admitted, the ball has been set rolling; where it will be necessary to stop, the future alone will tell. Will it be expanded to include hospitals and all education, both for rich and poor? Certainly the condition of the poor is vastly different now to what it was in comparatively recent years, and this most welcome condition has been arrived at by improvement in social legislation. All Acts of the legislature now dealing with the condition of the poorer classes are socialistic, whether carried by Tory or Liberal majorities. This is fortunate, for no other is tolerable; and if it was not so, another revolution, worse than the French one, would long ago have taken place. Wisely the English nation disarms the revolution by granting wise and salutary reforms in time. Many condemn the idea of a progressive income-tax, alleging that it would prove a preventative to anybody working to increase his personal wealth, as he would naturally think that the more he acquired the more he would have to pay in taxation. One can only say in answer to this, that the present system of taxing income does not altogether prevent people from being possessed with the craving to become rich. The greatest of all boons, and alleviation to our present troubles, would be a heavy tax on those who voluntarily limited the number of their children; in other words, the removal of taxation from those who had large families to those who had few children or none, by their own desire. No tax could be fairer than this; no tax more just; no tax better calculated to bring in large sums to the revenue; no tax more popular, for all would at once recognize its justice; no tax could prove of more immense value to the State, for it would cause the best types to pause and consider what they would have to pay before they gave themselves up to extinction. Women who, from physical causes, might be

unable to bear children could be protected by a certificate, as unfit vaccination cases are now. French statesmen and learned societies are advocating the imposition of such a tax at once in France; and when the depopulation of England becomes as important a question as that of France is now, it will certainly have to be imposed here also. That it is a mere question of time in France there is not the slightest doubt whatsoever, and it will equally be the case in England.

Some believe that a great alleviation to our present distress would be found in altering our present custom of disposing of wealth by will. One of the greatest boons that could be conferred upon the world would be to render the making of a will illegal. All property, no matter whether real or personal, land or coins, should be equally divided at the death of the owner amongst the nearest relatives. What heart-burnings, what selfishness, what jealousies, so often exhibited by poor human nature beside death-beds, would be prevented if the making of a will was rendered illegal. Can anything be more unjust than that the widow and children, who had borne perhaps for years most cruel sufferings from the husband and father, should be left penniless by him? "If, despairing of justice, the faithful wife endures patiently through life for the sake of her children's future, the English law permits an unfaithful husband and father at death to will away every penny of his property from his wife and children to a charity, a stranger, or a mistress." Can any injustice be more outrageous, more inhuman, than this? All these questions relating to women's rights, divorce, and equal justice to both sexes, can only be settled when women, married and single, have the franchise. What more monstrous absurdity and injustice can there be than that degraded, vicious, drunken men should have voices in the legislation of England, while all our cultured, sensible women are silenced, and have no power to remove the wrongs they suffer from? Is not the principle of equal division amongst widow and children right and just, and if no widow or children, amongst near relatives? Why should the dead hand have the right to order directions with regard to the use of wealth, which time and circumstances are continually changing. "There is no foundation in nature or in natural law why the son should have the right to exclude his fellow-creatures from a determinate spot of land because his father had done so before him, or why the occupier of a

particular field or of a jewel, when lying on his death-bed, and no longer able to maintain possession, should be able to tell the rest of the world which of them should enjoy it after him." (Blackstone.) What numbers of persons are now suffering from the effects of the dead hands who, a hundred years since, ordered that their money should be only invested in land. If such proceedings were not disastrous in their present effects they would be ludicrous.

The further we go back we always find that righteous principle, that property should be equally divided amongst the children, fully declared and held. The old Anglo-Saxon law of gavelkind, still in use in parts of Kent, splendidly upheld this doctrine of equal inheritance by sons and daughters. It surely is a mystery, beyond righteous understanding, why an eldest son should inherit the bulk of the property and his brothers and sisters comparatively nothing; again, why should the brother, who is better qualified to earn money than the sister, be better provided for than she who is the weaker vessel?

That all such injustice will pass away as soon as Christian exiles come to be practised more than they are now, there troubles be the least doubt. By equal division of property regard to all amongst the children or near relatives, wealth life, can only have more and more subdivided with more justice to discern any "The Ethics of Wills," *Economic Review*, April, else. When regard to the equal division of land at the difficulties with, as in France, see *Welfare of the Millions, and Nationalization*. The evil results of the law of entail in England will be noticed under the Land question.

Another suggestion made to deal with our present condition is that the production and sale of food should not be left to private interests and public competition. In a matter so closely connected with the health of the nation, it would seem better that the necessities of life should be provided merely at the cost of their production and sale by the State, than by unscrupulous private individuals, who have only their own interests to serve. This principle has been admitted in other similar directions. We see certain methods of social intercourse as letters and telegrams, of less necessity than food, removed from public competition and handled by the State, with marvellously beneficial results to all concerned. Surely the same might, with equal benefit, be

effected as regards the production and sale of necessary food. When we think of the miserable stuff which goes by the name of food that the poor have to consume, unable to get anything better, in consequence of the profit to the middle-man, we might well strive to see the whole matter of the supply of food undertaken by the State. I do not see why the rich should object to this, as they would benefit just as much as the poor.

There is a great unfairness exhibited in these things at the present day. Why should those who are idle, who only live for luxury, have the best food, which they do not need, while the man who works, who needs the best and most nourishing kind, cannot obtain it? "The great inequality of riches which on the one hand compels the masses of the people to live poorly, on the other hand encourages unproductive consumption and raises the standard of food of the wealthier classes. It has brought about that the upper classes in every civilized country eat more than is necessary, and even beyond what their constitution can bear without harm." What an inversion of justice and right it all is that those who need the best and most nourishing foods should be unable to procure them, while those who need ^{not} ~~not~~ have them in abundance? Can such an ^{arrangement} ~~unequalities~~ of things last much longer? Lepetit says t away every miserable economic system prepares exquisite ^{of a} ~~of~~ a charity, delicacies for the rich. Yet it cannot provide ^{more} ~~more~~ out-with a bed to lie upon. Impoverished and ^{questions} ~~and~~ insufficient food, he has to go forth morning after ^{both} ~~morning~~ to exhausting toil. See also what Richard Jefferies says this point in *Toilers of the Field*.

If it be said that the tendency of to-day to municipalize all our institutions, to nationalize our land, and to place the sale of food in the hands of the State, would be a removal of all prudential checks to marriage, I affirm, without the least hesitation, that in an ideal state there should be no checks to marriage whatever, except physical ones; certainly none on the economic side. Marriage is a God-given gift to man, to serve as a preventative against vice, and therefore it never can be wrong to exercise it, except when sins of former generations have affected the present. There are signs that the present-day competition, and all its attendant evils, must come to an end from its own

inherent evils. Competition is creating monopolies, the richer companies are buying up and absorbing all competitors in their trades, with the obvious result of evil to the consumer. Surely we can say with justice, that it would be better for the State to have a monopoly for the benefit of all, than that a company should have it for the sake of a few. Looking at this point from every direction, we can readily see its justice and utility. Land, railways, food, every market and department of human industry—how soon will the time come when all these will be administered for the public good and not for private greed and gain? When such comes to pass, there need be no fear that a natural growth of population would ever suffer. Certainly there would be no necessity for the practice of Neo-Malthusianism.

The Christian Social Union has been founded to teach the spirit of Christian self-sacrifice and charity, and bring them more generally into usual practice towards the poor than has hitherto been the case. This is a grand work, the noblest for the follower of Christ to adopt. In carrying them out he approaches more nearly to the life of Him who was surely "an example of godly life." We may be quite sure that all the troubles and difficulties which threaten to assail us, with regard to all the complex problems of population and modern life, can only have their solution in Christ. It is impossible to discern any other ray of hope from anywhere by anything else. When the Christian comes face to face with various difficulties in human life which seem to mortal men wholly insurmountable, and to defy human solution, he must, if his faith be worth anything, turn to Him, His life and teaching, whom he believes to be God incarnate, and there find solutions for all the difficulties which perplex mankind. By more earnestly teaching that most excellent gift of charity, the Church can effect a great deal towards mitigating our present great and terrible amount of human suffering. Her manifest duty is to teach all men that they are brothers, and when one suffers the whole body does so likewise. It is her plain duty to uphold the rules of Christian morality; if she does not, other societies, which mock at Christianity, will have their say and way, and then a cataclysm will ensue. The Church must guide, must teach, must reprove, no matter in what high places; if she does not, she ceases to be Christ on earth. The duties of self-sacrifice and alms-giving are

those means most in accordance with the mind of Christ for lessening human misery.

There is just a small matter in connection with the Church's work on alms-giving which may be mentioned here, for it needs much reform. There is no doubt that in the early days of the Church, the alms collected in the Churches were expended upon the sick and poor; but this most excellent Christian principle has, alas, in these degenerate days, like many other things in the Church, become wantonly abused. We see immense sums of money collected in our churches, but the bulk of it is expended upon unnecessary spiritual luxuries, such as music, flowers, etc., which was certainly not the case in earlier and purer times. Some of the published balance-sheets of London West End churches show a thousand a year spent on such-like luxuries, and about twenty or thirty on the sick and poor. This is altogether contrary to the primitive custom of expending alms collected in churches.

In that last dread scene so vividly described for our warning in the New Testament, the reward was in accordance with what each one had done to lessen the sufferings of his fellow-passengers in the journey of life. There is a vast difference between the voluntary act of self-sacrifice exercised in the Christian spirit of alms-giving and that of the present one of compulsory poor-rates. The Christian principle of voluntary alms-giving was greatly limited in England at the time of the suppression of the monasteries; it was abused then, no doubt, but the principle, a voluntary, not a compulsory one, was correct. Compulsion, which is most in vogue now, has almost killed it. People say, why should I give to the poor, when I already contribute large sums to the poor-rate? The principle of the compulsory poor-rate was inaugurated in Elizabeth's reign. Some legislation had to be taken in hand to deal with the swarms of indigent poor who then covered the land, since the monasteries, their previous support, had been annihilated under the infamous Henry. His favourites were not of the class which is inclined to exercise Christian charity. They glutted themselves with the lands and revenues of the spoiled, and were far too much occupied in feathering their own nests to bestow even a passing thought upon the suffering poor, whom their robberies had cast out upon a cruel and heartless world. "Whilst the Church held its possessions

and spread its convents and monasteries over the land, the workhouse was not required. One quarter of the tithe then received was devoted to the aid of the aged and poor. No traveller, however humble, was refused food and lodging. The monks were the teachers as well as the preachers of the country, and in this capacity rendered an inestimable service to English agriculture no less than to English scholarship. It has been truly said that whilst the Church held her lands there was practically no absolute pauperism. Afterwards poverty haunted alike the purlieus of the towns and the byeways of the country. It was becoming a danger no less than a disgrace, and, after repeated and unsuccessful endeavours to check its spread, Elizabeth and her Government were at last compelled to pass the Act of 1601. At the beginning of the Tudor period pauperism was unknown, at its termination it became a national institution." (Booth.)

At the end of Henry's reign, and during Edward's, the condition of the poor had become piteous in the extreme. The remedies adopted to cope with the state of things which had been brought about were torture and mutilation. The country became overrun with beggars. At the end of one of her royal progresses, Elizabeth is said to have exclaimed, "*Pauper ubique jacet!*" The principle of helping the poor became in her reign compulsory; none other, I suppose, was possible then, and so it has continued to the present day; still it is a wrong one. Everybody condemns the existing system and all it entails—the enormous expenses, its mode of operation, the huge barrack-like, ugly buildings, and their inmates, idle, forbidden to do any productive work lest they should interfere with the various trades outside. Good and bad, deserving and undeserving, are all mixed up together.

But there are now indications that classification of the unfortunate inmates of workhouses is being undertaken with most successful results. The Whitechapel Guardians have wisely divided their aged and infirm into two classes, and provide recesses and compartments where the first-class may form their own companionships or be alone. The value of this boon to some of the respectable poor can hardly be estimated. One of the great terrors of workhouse life to a sensitive disposition is the total absence of all chance of retirement. Day-time in the day-room, meal-time in the dining-hall, at night in the dormitory, the man is surrounded by

his fellow-paupers, forced to listen to their conversation ; there is not a spot to which he can go and say, "Here I can be alone." And to the aged man and woman taken away, possibly, from some quiet cottage this is intolerable ; the prison cell would be more acceptable.

At Southampton the Guardians have a comfortably furnished room set apart for the best of the old women, which goes by the name of the Drawing-room.

At Coventry, out of 350 or 400 inmates, some fifty are classified off, living and sleeping apart, having every facility for going out, and not wearing workhouse clothes.

At Sheffield the scheme is in full operation, and, although the conditions for Classes I. and II. are most stringent, no less than 140 out of 550 inmates fall into it. The fact that one workhouse contains no less than 140 persons who can undergo a severe scrutiny as to character, and are there through no fault of their own, is a strong plea for a more indulgent treatment of our aged poor.

Another union that has carried a similar scheme into effect, and reports most favourably upon it, is Kingston-upon-Hull. There the first-class consists of the aged, and those of any age who are incapable of work, whose characters before and after entering the house are good. There is no qualifying length of residence fixed, but a preference is given to those who have paid rates the longest time. For these comfortable rooms are set apart, laid with linoleum, and sanitary paper upon the walls. The tables are covered with cloths ; arm-chairs, mirrors and pictures, cupboards, books, and flowers are provided. The inmates may go in and out at any time, and receive visits from their friends, and are allowed to sit up till nine o'clock. Their clothing is not uniform ; the men wear suits of tweed or their own clothes if good enough. The food is served with great care.

It is very gratifying to observe that the Local Government Board has sanctioned these improved arrangements. Another great wrong in the Poor Law system is that clergy, who happen to be Guardians of the Poor, declare one day in church that it never should be lawful to put asunder those whom by matrimony God had made one, yet in a few days or weeks, perhaps, they are obliged to order the separation of a child-bearing couple. The irony of the system is complete. Long and bitter controversies go on amongst Guardians,

stirring up additional strife, with regard to out-door and in-door relief. The very class itself which it was intended to benefit loathe the very name of the whole thing. Many a poor creature says, "I do not fear death, but I fear the workhouse." Instead of its being a help to the poor and distressed, it is exactly the opposite; some would rather die of starvation than have anything to do with it. The fact is that the whole administration of the Poor Law has broken down. It was intended to be a deterrent to able-bodied men, causing them to do their utmost to seek work before they applied for entrance there as the last resource. Now, times have changed; this class does very well, or much better than it formerly did outside, and the inmates of the workhouse have become the aged, the helpless, the sick, yet they are treated with the utmost severity. Nothing needs more reform than the administration of the Poor Law.

It seems horrible that the poor old couple who have lived and laboured in their native village all their lives long, who have worked and toiled, long and hard, for the pecuniary benefit of others rather than for their own, and brought up children, too often with bitter self-denial, on scanty pittances, should, in their old age, have nothing to look forward to but the workhouse as their last home on earth, to separation from relatives, and all that is dear to them in life; surely the bitterness of death is increased by all this unnecessary cruelty. Anybody who has worked amongst the poor is only too familiar with the intense dislike which they naturally show to the present Poor Law system and all its detestable enormities. Yet it is to this that the vast majority of the poor—certainly the agricultural poor—only have to look to for their latter days. The saying in Dorsetshire is:

"Dry bread, all work, and no pay,
Go to the Union, some day."

There has always been a golden age for opulence, but no age, save a desolate one, for indigence.

"In the year 1888, out of 79,000 deaths which took place in London, 10,170 took place in workhouses, 7,113 in public hospitals, and 380 in public asylums, or more than one-fifth of the whole number; one in four dependent upon public charity. But this includes all classes of society; if taking the working classes alone it must be much higher." (*Problems of*

Poverty.) In the year 1894 twenty-four per cent. of the deaths in London took place in public institutions. It is an awful thought, affording terrible contemplation for the rich, that thirty per cent. of those who produce the wealth for their enjoyment die in the pauper lunatic asylum, the hospital, and the workhouse. What an end to a life of toil? How can such a state of injustice last?

In the year 1894 the number of deaths registered in public institutions in England amounted to 65,496; in Ireland to 12,740; the Scotch registration returns do not apparently give this information. The United Kingdom, notwithstanding all the hatred which it evolves, spends more in proportion upon its Poor Law system than any other European country. Mulhall gives the expenditure in 1888.

United Kingdom	10,700,000
France .	1,500,000
Germany	4,600,000
Austria .	400,000
Italy .	1,900,000
Holland .	510,000
Switzerland	1,050,000

On Lady-Day of the year 1895 the Poor-rate of England and Wales reached the enormous sum total of £9,866,605. On the 1st of January, 1895, the number of paupers in England was 777,213; on the 1st of January, 1896, the number was 780,288. In 1861 the amount levied for Poor-rates was at the rate of 7s. 11½d. per head; in 1891 the amount levied was at the rate of 10s. 9¼d. In 1861 the officials employed received but £660,370; in 1891 this had increased to £1,452,810. The total cost for these years, ending Lady-Day, is as follows:—

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Lady-Day (1891)	£ 8,643,318
Do. (1892)	8,847,678
Do. (1893)	9,217,514
Do. (1894)	9,673,505

“On January 1st, 1894, the number of paupers amounted to 821,921; the same on January 1st, 1895, to 827,593.” (Whitaker). Notwithstanding the universal adoption of

Neo-Malthusianism, there is much more poverty in France than in England. The following figures are taken from the *Annuaire Statistiques de la France*, and prove it:—

	NO. OF BUREAUX DE BIENFAISANCE.		NO. OF THOSE RELIEVED.		NOMBRE DE SECOURS ACCORDE.	
1880	...	14,071	...	1,442,440	...	—
1881	...	14,033	...	1,449,021	...	—
1882	...	14,287	...	1,449,330	...	—
1883	...	14,485	...	1,405,552	...	—
1884	...	14,700	...	1,443,320	...	—
1885	...	14,574	...	1,778,354	...	—
1886	...	14,944	...	1,440,744	...	—
1887	...	14,948	...	1,440,666	...	—
1888	...	15,138	...	1,577,964	...	12,910,798
1889	...	15,308	...	1,616,481	...	14,756,900
1890	...	15,202	...	1,705,439	...	14,837,282
1891	...	15,515	...	1,705,290	...	15,783,608
1892	...	15,227	...	1,664,320	...	16,027,287

There is much waste in the mode of administering poor relief in France, but more in England.

The fact is that the money collected in the United Kingdom nominally for the poor is expended upon unnecessary staffs of officials. How much simpler, how much more welcome, how much cheaper, yet how much more efficacious would it be if smaller houses or cottages in the style of the mediæval almshouse were maintained in the villages. We have only to go to France to see these most charming examples of this kind of hospice for the poor. Under the present system in England there is extravagant waste; and, notwithstanding its high expenditure, the system breaks down in most important points. For instance, it is found most deleterious to the morals of the children, considering what class they are taken from, to herd them together, consequently the boarding-out system has to be adopted. This is, of course, a step in the right direction, and will no doubt in the end be the means of proving that this true principle of extension and not concentration is the proper one to adopt with regard to the deserving poor.

"In England there are 238,489 children who are dependent on the rates. Of these 59,957 are entirely fed, clothed, and housed by the Poor Law authorities, while 178,532 receive out-door relief. In London, out of 18,000 pauper children, 14,000 are housed in large barrack schools, from which

ophthalmia and ringworm are hardly ever absent. So hideous has been the failure of the barrack system that no difficulties should deter the nation from ridding itself of such a monstrous growth as speedily as possible."

Let the idle, the vicious, and the drunken be dealt with in the most exemplary and vigorous way, with the utmost discipline; but let the deserving poor remain in the village almshouse aided by old-age pensions. What a blessed relief for them this would all prove! In this scheme there would be exhibited more of the Christian spirit of alms-giving than is the case under the present harsh administration of an inflexible poor-house system. In no country of the world are children supported by charity allowed to be congregated together as they are in England. Miss Davenport Hill shows us that the Scotch have eighty-four per cent. of these children living with foster parents; in Switzerland seventy-four per cent.; in Germany boarding is compulsory; in the Colonies always adopted; in Russia ninety per cent. are distributed amongst families willing to take them. Yet in London only six per cent. are boarded out, and the percentage throughout England is much lower. What a marvellous improvement it would be to adopt this continental system! Each child under the barrack system costs eleven shillings a week, yet ophthalmia, which attacks only two per cent. of those outside, affects fifteen to twenty per cent. of the workhouse children.

Besides, the whole manner of dealing with the undeserving poor is notoriously defective. For them there should be a great deal more of detention exercised. Here is an example of how the present system of too excessive liberty is abused. A woman openly living a notoriously evil life has three children, all less than eight years of age, under her care. Half her time is spent in the workhouse. She takes the children in and out, as she has done for the last five or six years. For a fortnight or three weeks or a month the children will be in the workhouse, and will attend its school. The mother one morning suddenly demands her release and theirs, and goes off at her own sweet will for four months, living the old life in her old haunts. Then suddenly she determines to go into the workhouse again. She brings the children back with her, and asks admission for herself and them, admission which cannot be refused. She stays a month or two, and then disappears until it graciously pleases her to return. Her whole family has

been for two generations back as degraded as she is now. One of her children is reported to be a bright, sharp child, but she already shows the mother's fatal tendency to lewdness; although only eight years old she is well learned in the knowledge of evil, and uses, with a fearful precocity, the vilest language. Surely the people of which she is a type should be kept in control under more rigid discipline. Towards the aged and deserving poor, living the evening of their days in the almshouse of their native villages, better opportunities of exercising charity would be given to their neighbours than there are now, when they are carried off and placed in the Poor Law barracks. By preaching, in season and out of season, less harsh treatment of the deserving poor, more self-sacrifice for one another, more Christian alms-giving, we shall be doing a great deal towards relieving the stress of population, and removing any so-called necessity for the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. That the present condition of things can last much longer seems impossible. If some wise and moral measures are not soon undertaken to ameliorate our present distress, immoralities of all sorts will consume the very vitals of the nation. Everywhere we hear the plaintive cry from the poor and suffering that the Almighty did not create them to undergo such sufferings, to starve in the midst of plenty, to live such lives, under such terrible conditions, as they have to do now. Increasing numbers of men, women, and children are pleading with outstretched arms, appealing with piteous despair, to anybody or anything that will help them in the struggle to obtain a fairer reward for their labour, a juster share in the distribution of their production. "The struggle for existence is assuming a form which it never had before; and as a struggle is more ferocious between the species which most resemble each other and have therefore the same needs, so the struggle is more intense in a society like ours where all have the same aspirations to wealth, and tend with equal ardour to raise themselves in the economic sphere." (Nitti.)

No less than seventy-one people died in London during the year 1895 from sheer starvation. Of these twenty-nine were women. The numbers tend to increase. In the year 1894 the number was thirty-nine. From whence, said a certain philosopher, come all the sins and miseries of the world—stealing, murders, the agonies of suicide, imprisonment, the increased bitterness of death in consequence of being obliged

to leave one's children unprovided for and abandoned to the tender mercies of a heartless and merciless world, starvation, want, privation, cold, prostitution, vice, impossibility of marriage, ignorance, drunkenness, disease, enfeebled health in consequence of insufficiency of food, early deaths, *cum multis aliis*, all the miseries which disturb mankind, but from some persons possessing more of wealth than others. This unequal possession causes many to live lives under surroundings which inevitably tend to draw out all that is evil in the world and human nature. In these days of improvement it seems marvellous to think that so many miseries should follow in the wake of some having a few less possessions than others. It certainly will not be always so. Cardinal Manning's words are true: "These things cannot go on; these things ought not to go on; the accumulation of wealth in the land, the piling up of wealth like mountains in the possession of classes or individuals cannot go on, if these moral conditions of our people are not healed. No commonwealth can rest on such conditions. If the great end of life were to multiply yards of cloth and cotton-twist, and if the glory of England consists or consisted in multiplying without stint or limit these articles and the like at the lowest possible prices, so as to undersell all the nations of the world, well, then, let us go on. But if the domestic life of our people be vital, above all, if the peace, the purity of homes, the education of children, the duties of wives and mothers, the duties of husbands and fathers, be written in the natural law of mankind, and if these things are sacred, far beyond anything that can be sold in the market, then, I say, if the hours of labour resulting from the unregulated sale of a man's strength and skill shall lead to the destruction of domestic life, to the neglect of children, to turning wives and mothers into living machines, and of fathers and husbands into creatures of burden, who rise up before the sun, and come back when it is set, wearied and able only to take food and to lie down to rest, the domestic life of men exists no longer."

The mortality of well-to-do children in the United Kingdom is under eight per cent. in the first year of life, but among the poor the figure often rises to over thirty per cent.

"Where poverty lies,
One may stay till he dies;
But where gold doth abound
Much more can be found."

It is needless, perhaps, to add that the mortality of the needy classes is always much higher than the well-to-do. Is this right? Three Unions give the following statistics, thereby affording much consideration for Christian consciences to dwell upon :—

AVERAGE AGE AT DEATH.

	GRNTRY.	SHOPKEEPERS.	ARTIZANS.
St. George's, Hanover Square	45	29	27
Strand	43	33	22
Bethnal Green	45	26	16

It must create an unwelcome skeleton at the banquets of the rich for them to become aware that the possession of their wealth has only been obtained by depriving others of life.

“Many faint with toil
That few may know the cares and woes of sloth.”

It can all be summed up in that most apt phrase, *Summum jus, summa injuria*. The horrible thought that vast numbers simply pine away and slowly die in consequence of the existing unjust distribution of wealth must come home to those who possess one atom of conscience. Can this be doing justice to our neighbour? It is the result of individualism and the fury of competition. Infanticide, quick and painless death ere the slow one begins, is advocated by some as a remedy, as a more merciful manner of dealing with an unjustly stricken humanity. We are sometimes advised to deal with it as we deal with puppies and kittens. This is merely a sign of the times, showing to what a pitch modern thought has come, and what a climax miserable poverty and wretchedness have reached. “The world is too hard upon the poor man, and makes him pay too heavy a toll out of his short life.” It must readily be admitted that the poor man, especially the agricultural labourer, has but a very paltry share of this world's pleasures. However, it is one consolation to know that all the warnings of the Bible are directed against the rich, and all the promises to the poor. There was nothing, as the world would say, very disgraceful about Dives, no flagrant vice. It is only recorded of him that he was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; yet his condition in the next world is not such a one as any of us would envy.

That a great deal of present-day misery could be reduced without doing any harm to anybody is self-evident, thus also reducing the temptations to impurity and immorality, which are so real and terrible at the present time. The total abolition of poverty we cannot look for or expect in this present world, but we should all do our utmost to mitigate pauperism and misery in every possible way, with their attendant evils of all manner of immoralities. We have no right or reason to believe that undue poverty is inevitable, and that it must be for ever the doom of the vast majority of the human race. Canon Liddon rightly distinguished between poverty and pauperism. Of the latter, he said that it meant an absence, not of the mere comforts, but of the very necessities of life; it meant a despairing acquiescence in want as in something inevitable by large numbers of men; it meant the creation of a class which feels itself disinherited, so incapable of the duties as to be deprived of the rights of human society; and thus it meant, in the long run, not merely class misery, misery vast and untold, but general disorder. We cannot hope to remove all this state of things, the results of centuries of all manner of evil and selfishness, in a day. We cannot, spiritually or economically, regenerate the world in one year, or ten years; but we can, each one of us, no matter how insignificant our respective places may be in the world, strive to leave it, and those we leave behind us, a little better for our having played a part in it.

One thing yet remains to be said. It is, that we may be quite sure that all the sad results of present-day poverty, its sorrows and its miseries, are not caused by God's appointment or wish, but by man's own sins and follies. Formerly it used to be supposed that the Almighty sent every drought, famine, and plague. We have learned better things than that by this time. We store the water He sends us in plenty, we add to our knowledge of agriculture, and we cleanse our sewers. We believe, in a word, that God helps those who help themselves, and that we must not idly fold our hands and leave everything to Him to do for us. Some poor may be always with us, but we may be quite sure that it is not by God's wish that many are; yet being here, they tend to draw out the best side of man's character, his charity, his love, his self-sacrifice, and his devotion. In fact, they give the rich the opportunity of doing the work of God. Trials and sufferings have their due and

proper place in this world's economy, but starvation in the midst of plenty need not be one of them.

It is not my intention to comment further here upon those many reforms which advanced thinkers on the subject declare would be most beneficial in combating the economic and immoral evils of the present day; they can be judged of in numberless writings on the subject. I am glad, however, to observe that many of those most advanced in thought of this nature unite in condemning Neo-Malthusianism, declaring it to be a mere red herring trailed along the course to withdraw the chase from the proper scent, which is fair distribution. They can see very clearly that it would merely tend to diminish the increase of production which is so very necessary for the welfare of all. It seems to me that, without attempting any of the proposed more advanced and wild schemes, some of which must be more or less chimerical, we have in improvement of education, marriage, tenure of land, emigration, temperance, and spread of co-operative homes, much ground for hope in being able to deal with the problems of over-population and the increasing practice of Neo-Malthusianism. Improvements in these things are by no means outside the range of possibility, and their capabilities for help in these directions will be discussed under their respective headings.

That we are now suffering from the effects of over-population is beyond any doubt. All these are the result of much injustice, gross ignorance, and sad neglect in the past of good advice on marriage to the young and heedless. If, say, fifty years ago proper remedies had been wisely adopted to cope effectually with the increase of population, things would not have reached the terrible pitch which they have now. The matter has been hitherto utterly neglected; is it to be the same in the future? It simply cannot, for the result in the near future would be too appalling; the *laissez faire* system has been weighed in the balance and been found wanting; some new treatment must be adopted.

In ancient times the pressure arising from an excess of population was dealt with by the merciless and immoral modes of abortion and infanticide. Nowadays this same pressure causes the equally immoral practice of Neo-Malthusianism to be adopted. New problems require new considerations and adjustment. It is not quite fair to those who are destined to succeed us that we should say, "Sufficient unto the

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

day is the evil thereof." We are now suffering from the sins of our forefathers in not dealing wisely with population; we surely ought not to pass them on, still more augmented, to our descendants. If some judicious handling of this most important matter, namely, the increase of population, is not undertaken, either by private enterprise or by the State, it seems to me that either vice and disease will consume the entire nation, or that Neo-Malthusianism, with all its disastrous moral, social, political, and physical evils, will be adopted by increasing numbers of families. Men and women will refrain from marriage and indulge in vice, or marry and have no children. Either is a piteous future to look forward to. Although increasing and enormous populations are blessings, and cause means of improvement to arise, are we not justified in endeavouring to mitigate the sufferings which they must always inevitably bring in their train? Although sin, vice, and prostitution may produce their Magdalens and their saints, are we not to war against them? Although war may be the very best means to purify a nation sunk in degeneracy and decay, yet are we not justified in mitigating the sufferings of the wounded? So are we justified in fighting against the evils of a reckless excess of population.

In consequence of the struggle for life now taking place, morality is rendered increasingly difficult and hard to maintain; marriage has become almost impossible, except for the well-to-do, yet sexual instincts cannot be unduly restrained; it is folly to attempt it. The hour for dealing with this terrible problem of over-population seems to have now arrived. If it is not dealt with by moral alleviations, it will be by immoral. The difficulty of dealing with it has provided misanthropical cynics with grounds for proposing frightful measures. For instance, one Weinhold, a councillor of the King of Saxony, Nitti tells us, actually had the audacity to seriously suggest that a certain number of boys of the poorest classes should annually be castrated. (With regard to this outrageous proposal, see *La Revue Socialiste*, February, 1892.) Everyone must agree that no greater problem in human history requires to be examined and unravelled more than this great crux of population, in which every question relating to human nature and its actions have their origin.

There are some who, although refusing to see any necessity at present for widely adopting Neo-Malthusianism, yet declare

that the world will undoubtedly one day become over-populated, and then there may come the necessity for its use, but that that time has not come yet. Many economists in olden times held the same opinion, namely, that if population is allowed to increase at its will, it will overpower the earth's capacity to support it, and that although every acre of the earth's surface should be cultivated as a garden, producing all it could do, yet the time must come when population will prove too much for it. Well, notwithstanding all the myriads of human beings which have existed on the earth, that, or anything like it, has never yet occurred. "As a matter of fact the increase of food products has outrun the increase of population, and each generation, since Malthus' day, has had more to eat than that before it; and it is now claimed that, by treating the soil as a laboratory instead of as a farm, we can increase the supply of food almost indefinitely." (Bowker.) Again, Graham writes on the same point: "Doubtless a day may come when all the earth will be fully peopled, although, as a fact, it has hitherto peopled very slowly, and some countries have become unpeopled. Such a day may come, as a day may come when all our coal may be used up. And both eventualities would be very serious. But both are a good way off for one consolation; moreover, some saving chance may always turn up in the interim; some substitute for coal might be extorted from nature by science, just as coal itself was found when wood began to fail for fuel, and something might be discovered to save us from the danger of over-population at that distant date." Ott writes: "The question of a population that will overcome the world is so far away from us that, if it ever really occurs, it will be at a time which science can neither determine nor foresee." Nitti says: "What will happen in a distant future need not give us trouble. Posterity will have gathered such a mass of facts, observation, and study, that it can well face the problems, the very existence and nature of which are hidden from us."

China, with its vast population of 300,000,000, does not find itself very much overcrowded, notwithstanding the atrocious economic system under which it labours; for the great population there has acted as a stimulus to force out of the soil all it is capable of producing. Those who have had experience of Chinese gardeners in Melbourne and Sydney can readily testify to the skill with which they

make the most of every plot of ground under their care. Max Nordau says that if the soil of Europe was treated, tilled, and managed as that of China is, it could support one thousand millions of human beings, instead of its three hundred and sixteen millions, which it does now. China, no doubt, has its famines, but these are not caused either by diminishing returns or the infertility of the soil, but by gross misgovernment. Arguing from our experience of the present century, it is quite impossible to form any definite conception what improvements in the production of food the science of chemistry will effect in the immediate future. Renan wrote: "When one thinks of the social revolution which will be accomplished when chemistry will have found the means, by imitating the work of leaves, and in capturing carbonic acid from the air, of producing food superior to that which vegetables and the beasts of the field supply us with."

Writing upon this point another distinguished man of science says: "We may reckon upon possibilities not to be now determined, on chemical discoveries, on industrial inventions, which are now out of man's power, but which the future will reveal." The Italian physiologist Albertoni says that the discovery which would most benefit the world now would be that of azote in a form easy of assimilation. See the writings of Siemens, Eisler, Liebig, Mantegazza, on this point of probable future foods. "Applied science will provide our descendants with ingenious contrivances as yet not dreamed of." (Longstaffe.)

If such things are to take place, we may hope for a time when food will be attainable without much cost. We now enjoy the fruits of discoveries in this direction which our ancestors could not have imagined, and, judging from this fact, we have grounds for hope in believing that something of a similar kind will take place with reference to our descendants and their sustenance. We see to-day our 40,000,000 of English better fed than our 12,000,000 were during the last century.

What have we not seen effected in our own time in the shape of all kinds of concentrated foods? It seems a waste of power that animals should be maintained to convert certain simple substances into food suitable for mankind. Surely we may hope for a time when these intermediaries

can be dispensed with. Senior declared that food has always increased faster than population, in spite of the alleged tendency of population to increase faster than food. "I admit the abstract power of population to increase so as to press upon the means of subsistence; I deny the habitual tendency; I believe it to be just the reverse." Doubleday said that scanty nutriment stimulated reproduction, as abundant food checked it, and then drew the conclusion that as ample food would be in the future the rule, and not the exception, the average fecundity of the human race would be lessened. "At present and for centuries to come we must allow that the facility for satisfying wants, the raising of the general well-being, will increase as the population becomes denser." (Hertska.)

Moreover, looking at the geographical area of the world, we can plainly see that there are enormous sources yet to be drawn upon, even without a single new invention, which are capable of supporting a very greatly increased amount of population. What a vast number of new foods are now imported into this country, and all over Europe, which were unknown to exist, certainly unattainable, even a century ago. Besides, it must be taken into consideration that production has never yet reached its possible extent. "The son has no more children than his father had, but by the help of the steam-engine he can multiply the power tenfold."

Herein is a very practical answer to those theorists who think that the world cannot support an increased population. We see how improved modes of transit came into being with increased population, each of which became in turn insufficient when numbers increased. No matter what theories may be held as to the power of the world to feed increased population, we have solid grounds for believing that when such arrives it will find sufficient food to support it. Henry George said: "The increase of man involves the increase of his food. Formerly in the United States there were only a few hundred thousand, now forty-five millions, but there is no difficulty in providing the food, which did not bring the men, but the men it. The substances which form man's food have the power to reproduce themselves some billion folds more than man himself has."

With regard to the space on the earth's surface for containing population, some curious and interesting calculations have

been made. For instance, taking the world's population at present to amount to about 1,450,000,000, one calculator writes as follows: "If all these persons were in England and Wales, they would each have a space of about one hundred and fifty square yards. If spread over the whole of the United Kingdom, they would each have a space of rather more than three hundred square yards. If collected in a city built in the ordinary way, their houses, streets, gardens, parks, etc., would occupy a space of some twenty millions of acres, say one-half of England and Wales. But if formed into a crowd, they would find abundant standing-room in the county of Rutland. If the United Kingdom were all as densely populated as England, it would possess about 60,000,000 inhabitants. If Europe were all as densely populated as England, it would possess about 2,100,000,000, more than six times as many as it has now. If the whole world were as densely populated as England, its population would be about 28,000,000,000, or more than twenty times what it is at present."

From these figures we can easily see how much greater the population of the world might be, and no trouble, so far as space is concerned, would be likely to ensue.

Another calculator, writing in *The Strand Magazine*, tells us that every living person on the earth could be contained in a square common less than twenty-two miles each way. Each person could have a square yard to stand on, and any expert cyclist could ride round it in about three and a half hours; or each person could occupy a square yard of standing-room in the county of Bedfordshire, and then only fill up two-thirds of that county. They could all fit into Radnorshire, leaving the rest of the world empty. The whole population of the earth could be packed in a cubic box measuring only 1,140 yards. Each person could be allowed 27 cubic feet of room inside such a box, and the box itself could be deposited, when full, in Battersea Park with a squeeze; in Victoria Park with ample room to spare; or in Hyde Park, and not occupy much more than one-third of the ground-space of that Park. A cyclist could ride round the box in about six minutes, and a person on foot could stroll round the box and inspect it in only one hour. These facts are startling, yet perfectly true. They help to show us what a very small space of the earth's surface the population of the world occupies now. But to return to the immediate object before us. Terrible and lamentable as the

results of present-day competition are, caused by not adopting measures to bring about an adjusted condition of population, they will not have existed in vain if they succeed in calling the attention of everybody to the dire necessity which exists for dealing justly and efficaciously with the increase of population. It seems to be the invariable rule, attendant upon all human action, that pain must precede pleasure or improvement. In consequence of the suffering undergone, man strains his utmost powers to obtain relief. That this universal rule will also take place in reference to our present stress of over-population there can be, I think, very little doubt. Verri says, with regard to this point of the necessity that everywhere exists for dealing with the increase of population, that pain is the only moving power in man. Bishop Butler shows us how, when any very great need arose in the world, there always followed the remedy, but the need caused the remedy to come. Through much human suffering, through much human agony it may be, yet in the end the remedy came. Miss Cobbe expresses the same idea in "All noblest things are born in agony." And again, Wallace says: "Great things can only be reached by means of sacrifice. The good and the brave reach the highest attainments through the stern discipline of dangers and disasters. It is thus that the noblest characters have been formed, and the sublimest destinies of nations have been achieved." Canon Scott Holland also expresses the same idea when he says, in *Logic and Life*, that all the present fruits of the advanced civilization which we enjoy have come through the enforced discipline and trials of those who preceded us. We may, therefore, hope that our present sufferings, through over-population, will be the means of bringing about a better state of things in the future. It is always the darkest hour before the dawn. We have now surely learned all that we should learn of the troubles which arise from excess of population. Experience and increased knowledge must come to our aid. "Excessive fecundity has secured the march of civilization. It will now fix regular limits to fecundity, and what Malthus and the Malthusians thought an inscrutable and profound mystery will certainly have nothing dangerous or terrible in the future." (Nitti.) Over-population in no way takes away or diminishes the force of the great truth that "Population is strength," and that the opposite is deterioration. But when we make use of the word

"population" in the phrase "Population is strength," we mean an effective, vigorous population, not a weak and comparatively useless one. We can now see in France various evidences of the truth of the opposite, namely, that a defect of population is a source of weakness. It used to be considered by the old school of politicians and economists that colonies were sources of weakness rather than of strength to their mother countries, but we have now learned that this view was quite false. We now know that they are great aids to strength, and the proof is that every European power is now endeavouring to obtain them by every means in its power. The following statistics may be useful. From 1884 to 1896 England has annexed something like 2,600,000 square miles. A writer in *The Times* has been reckoning up the extent of our possessions beyond the seas, and they amount, if the Indian Feudatory States be included, to 8,409,790 square miles: namely, in Europe, 120; in Asia, 1,414,000; in Africa, 300,000; in America, 3,610,000; and in Australasia, 3,085,540. In 1884 the colonial empire of France was 665,000 square miles. Since then she has increased it by two and a half millions of square miles: 1,500,000 in the Sahara; 300,000 on the Congo; 300,000 in Senegambia; and 250,000 in Madagascar. In the same period Germany has annexed 1,023,070, Belgium a million, and Italy half a million. England is proud of her colonial empire, the greatest the world has ever seen. We know that our colonies would help us in any great crisis; they are our markets for the sale of our manufactured goods, and resting-places for the overplus of our population. We rightly rejoice in all this, and the additional force which their possession adds to our voice in the world. But now how does France, which is at present straining every nerve to become a colonial power, stand with regard to aptitude for colonization? Well, she is almost powerless, simply because she has adopted a wrong method of dealing with increase of population. If England should adopt Neo-Malthusianism practices on the same scale as France has, we shall undoubtedly see her colonizing power become less and less, and that would have a disastrous effect upon her influence. The English principle for dealing with population is to colonize. The French restrict the number of their children, with the results we see. Algeria, New Caledonia, India, Tahiti, Cochin China, Siam, Tonquin, Madagascar, are all

convincing proofs of how France fails everywhere as a colonizing power. Of course it is because she has no surplus population to leave her shores in search of new homes and adventures. This is only to be expected, for, having but one son, French parents are loth to see him leave them and depart to a colony. Max Nordau says: "The young Frenchman is watched over with almost painful care from his birth, the more so that he is probably the only son of perhaps two or three children. His way is made easy for him in every fashion that can be devised by the loving and careful hearts of his father and mother. His very wife is chosen for him, and at the mere whisper of a colonial career, or even of a temporary emigration to a foreign country, his parents implore him to remember how precious his life is to them, and how far preferable is fifty years of France to a cycle of Cathay; in other words, how preferable is a quiet life in France to any existence elsewhere." Of course such a system as this robs the whole nation of all spirit of daring and adventure. The present frantic desire to acquire fresh colonial territory by France, to which not a Frenchman will go, is very ludicrous. Yves Guyot says: "Our experience in Cochin China goes to prove that our colonies serve rather as outlets for the capital of the French ratepayers than for the products of French industry. Colonized chiefly by Government officials, the purchases they make in France are made with the money we send out to them in salaries." French colonies have always been, and are now, supported by the ratepayers of France. On the other hand, English colonies are always self-supporting. Herein is one of the great differences between the two as colonizing powers. The returns for 1895 show us that Cochin China cost France £600,000 and Tunis £1,200,000 during that year. We are told that in the huge island of Madagascar, the third largest island in the world, now a French colony, outside the officials there are barely a hundred French colonists. So long as the French voluntarily, by means of artificial checks, limit the number of their children they never can be a colonizing power. The total area of French colonies, dependencies, and protectorates amounts to about 932,500 square miles, with a population of nearly 36,000,000. It is worthy of note, however, that within all these territories the number of Frenchmen proper does not exceed half a million, Algeria and Tunis excepted. The entire trade of the French colonies, exports and imports,

amounts to £16,502,877, about equal to that of Canada with England. (Whitaker.) Although Algeria is but thirty-six hours from Marseilles, the total French population is less than a quarter of a million, or about the same number of settlers as in our little colony of Queensland, which is not yet thirty-six years old. Mahaffy, commenting on this matter of French colonization, writes in the *Nineteenth Century*: "They may acquire territories, but they do not make them profitable. The newspaper of to-day tells me that the acquisition of Madagascar has already tempted English, American, and German immigrants for trading purposes, but no French! Whenever the French admit these races the colony prospers by foreign enterprise. If they be driven out, it lapses into stagnation. It is usual to say that the French have no genius for colonizing. That is only a restatement of facts. Perhaps in our day much of their ill-success may merely arise from the absence of over-population at home; from the want of younger sons in many families who must go abroad to make their fortunes; from the increased comforts of home life; and the precocity of the only son, whom his parents will not expose to such perils. If her population goes on decreasing she will ultimately be content to take some such position as is held by the Dutch, who were once masters of the seas." At the beginning of this century France had just as good a chance of founding a great colonial empire as England had (see Seeley's *Expansion of England*); but she failed, because her colonizing power even then was not equal to the demands made upon it.

France expended many millions of francs, and sacrificed many precious lives, in annexing Madagascar. Taylor remarks on this: "If they can make nothing of the smaller islands they possess in the same waters—Nossi-Bé, Mayotte, Sainte Marie, and Réunion—what will they do with the third largest island in the world?" Oliver says that the present condition of Réunion is very unsatisfactory. Absentee landlords and money spent in Paris that should go to benefit the starved estates of the colony are the roots of the evil.

While England is colonizing all the waste places of the earth, and spreading her language and customs all over the globe—we are told by competent authorities that in a century from now the English language will be the predominant one of the entire world—France is declining in all these things.

Commenting upon the extension of the Anglo-Saxon race throughout the world, Mayo Smith writes as follows: "We have now over 100,000,000 civilized white persons living in powerful communities whose speech is English. The countless thousands pouring into America must speak English if they are to succeed. The influence of a nation is not to be measured solely by the number of its inhabitants at home. There seems to be no doubt that the English language is the widest-spread, and is destined to be spoken by an increasingly large proportion of the civilized inhabitants of the earth."

With regard to the commerce of France, also, Neo-Malthusianism is beginning to tell a tale. The returns for 1894, the most recent available, show us that the entries and clearances of British ships in all the ports of France amounted to 9,477,000, or 1,852,000 tons more than those of the French flag itself. "From the year 1849 to 1858, 200,000 emigrants left France; in the same period 200,000 left Germany; 1,200,000 the United Kingdom. From 1865 to 1874 only 60,245 left France." (Cobb.) "No fewer than 154,000 emigrants from our British Isles entered the United States in 1881; whilst from France the number that took refuge there was only 5,227." (*Scientific Meliorism.*)

The French returns of the last census give the following figures relating to emigration from France:—

1878	2316
1879	3634
1880	4612
1881	4456
1882	4858
1883	4011
1884	6100
1885	6063
1886	7314
1887	11,170
1888	23,339
1889	31,354
1890	20,560

The writer of "1920" in *The Contemporary Review* for December, 1895, states that in the year 1920 English speaking peoples, with their subjects, will reach the great amount of 700,000,000; while France, at the same time, will recede to less than half what she now has. He also adds these grave

words: "France will, to a practical certainty, be reduced to the level of a third-rate power in 1920, simply from this capital and well-ascertained fact, that her people will not breed. The probable population of France will be in 1920 under 40,000,000, and unless the continuous decline of the birth-rate can be arrested, it will be very considerably under that figure. She has reached the maximum of her population, and seems bound to decline continually henceforward in relative power and influence."

Richet gives the following estimates with regard to population for 1932 :—

United States	190 millions.
Russia	158 "
Germany	83 "
Great Britain	63 "
Austria	51 "
France	44 "
Italy	44 "

Another authority states that at the end of the twentieth century the chief European States in their European territories, judging from their present rates of increase of population, will possess in round numbers :—

Russia .	250 millions.
United Kingdom .	100 "
Germany .	90 "
Austria-Hungary .	75 "
France .	45 "
Italy .	45 "

In the 18th century the numbers were :—

German Empire, Austria and Prussia	28 millions.
France . . .	26 "
Russia . . .	25 "
England . . .	12 "
United States . . .	3 "

In the year 1801 the numbers were :—

Russia .	40 millions.
France .	26 "
Germany .	25 "
Austria .	27 "
Italy .	17 "
United Kingdom .	16 "
Spain .	6 "

In the year 1895 the numbers were very nearly :—

Russia	108,787,000
United States	65,000,000
German Empire	52,244,503
Austria-Hungary	44,000,000
England	39,000,000
France	38,260,000
Italy	31,000,000
Spain	18,000,000

The order of precedence of the Great Powers with regard to population has varied :—

1850.	1896.
Russia.	Russia.
France.	United States.
Austria-Hungary.	Germany.
Germany.	Austria-Hungary.
United Kingdom.	United Kingdom.
Italy.	France.
United States.	Italy.

There are some ominous figures with respect to French and German populations which it would be well for the former to gravely consider. The population of Germany in 1890 amounted to 49,428,476 ; in 1895 it had reached 52,244,503, an increase in five years of 2,816,027. The increase in France during the same period amounted only to a paltry 124,000.

The increase of population in France is very slow ; the numbers were :—

1700	19,660,320
1801	27,349,003
1821	30,461,873
1856	36,039,364
1881	37,672,048
1886	38,218,903
1891	38,343,192
1896 (March)	38,228,969

“At the beginning of this century the population of France was nearly double that of the United Kingdom, 27,350,000 to 15,717,000. In 1891 there was only a difference of half a million in favour of France. That difference has since more than disappeared. In 1892, the last year for which French returns are available, the population of France had dropped to 38,323,000. So its continuance in subsequent years may

be presumed. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, the population had risen in 1893 to 38,440,000. It is therefore safe to assume that at the present time the population of the United Kingdom is not less than 39,000,000, and the population of France not more than 38,260,000. In other words, the United Kingdom is now three-quarters of a million ahead. The population of the United Kingdom was in

1712	9,420,000
1754	11,485,000
1801	15,717,000

That of France :—

1698	19,670,000
1762	21,770,000
1791	26,303,000
1801	27,350,000

In 90 years of last century the population of England only increased 41 per cent.; in 90 years of this century 228 per cent." (H. C., in *Daily Graphic*, December 19th, 1895.)

The increase per 1000 in decade ending the following years has been :—

	1820.	1830.	1840.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1890.
United Kingdom .	171	150	113	25	56	88	108	109
France . . .	47	69	51	45	27	7	11	37

The decrease of the population of Paris is very striking. On March 29th, 1896, the total population there amounted to 2,511,955. Since 1891 the increase has been 87,250, at the rate of 17,450 a year; between 1872 and 1876 the annual average increase was 34,753; between 1876 and 1881 it was 45,840; between 1886 and 1891 it was 32,752.

The following rough estimate gives an idea of the increase of the population of the United Kingdom and France :—

	UNITED KINGDOM.	FRANCE.
1480 . . .	3,700,000	12,600,000
1580 . . .	4,600,000	14,300,000
1680 . . .	5,532,000	18,800,000
1780 . . .	9,561,000	25,100,000
1880 . . .	35,004,000	37,400,000
1890 . . .	38,200,000	38,800,000

Mulhall gives the increase of the population in the following countries during the past sixty-five years :—

	INCREASE.	PER CENT.
United Kingdom	15,300,000	
France .	5,900,000	18
Germany .	5,900,000	75
Russia .	22,400,000	92
Austria .	13,500,000	45
Italy .	10,200,000	48
Other countries	22,500,000	62
United States	60,700,000	626
British Colonies	9,700,000	510

The estimated populations of the United Kingdom and France respectively have been as follows, thousands omitted :—

	UNITED KINGDOM.	FRANCE.
1871	31,556	36,544
1872	31,874	36,103
1873	32,178	36,281
1874	32,502	36,460
1875	32,839	36,638
1876	33,200	36,906
1877	33,576	37,048
1878	33,944	37,147
1879	34,303	37,366
1880	34,623	37,519
1881	35,934	37,672
1882	35,207	37,769
1883	35,450	37,866
1884	35,724	37,949
1885	36,016	38,128
1886		38,219
1887	36,599	38,320
1888	36,881	38,390
1889	37,179	38,460
1890	37,485	38,430
1891	37,797	38,343
1892	38,107	38,323
1893	38,440	
1894	38,786	
1896 (July)	39,451	

On Wednesday, January 6th, 1897, the complete returns of the census of 1896 in France were given. The total population of France then amounted to 38,517,975, an increase of only 175,027 since 1891. The department of Seine (Paris) has increased by 198,919—more than the whole of France—thus showing how the rural population is declining.

The respective birth-rates per 1000 have been :—

	UNITED KINGDOM.					FRANCE.
1801-10	—	...				32'3
1811-20	—	...				31'6
1820-30	—	...				30'8
1831-40	—	...				29'0
1841-50	—	...				27'4
1851-60	—	...				26'3
1861-70	—	...				26'3
1871	33'7	...				22'6
1872	34'3	...				26'8
1873	34'0	...				26'1
1874	34'4	...				26'2
1875	33'9	...				26'0
1876	34'8	...				26'2
1877	34'4	...				25'5
1878	34'0	...				25'2
1879	33'3	...				25'0
1880	32'7	...				24'5
1881	32'5	...				24'9
1882	32'3	...				24'8
1883	32'0	...				24'8
1884	32'2	...				24'8
1885	31'6	...				24'2
1886	31'5	...				23'9
1887	30'7	...				23'5
1888	30'1	...				23'1
1889	30'0	...				23'0
1890	29'2	...				21'8
1891	30'4	...				32'6
1892	29'5	...				22'1
1893	29'9	...				—
1894	28'9	...				—

The birth-rate all through France is 22 per 1000; this rate varies from Gers only 14 to Finistère 32'6. The death-rate is also 22 per 1000. The excess of births over deaths is only 1 per 1000 inhabitants. On the average there are 1050 births to 1000 deaths. In the Pas de Calais, 1566; in Orne, only 666. The deaths are in excess of the births in from 32 to 60 of 87 Departments.

The average annual surplus of births over deaths was, per 1000 :—

1811-20	5'7
1851-60	3'9
1881-85	1'6

The number of births in the respective countries have been as follows :—

YEAR.	UNITED KINGDOM.	FRANCE.
1826		992,266
1866		1,006,258
1867		1,007,755
1868		984,140
1869		948,526
1870		943,315
1871		826,121
1872		966,000
1873		946,364
1874		954,652
1875		950,975
1876	887,968	966,682
1877	888,200	944,576
1878	891,906	937,317
1879	880,389	936,529
1880	881,643	920,177
1881	883,642	937,057
1882	889,014	935,566
1883	890,722	937,944
1884	806,750	937,758
1885	894,270	924,558
1886	903,760	912,838
1887	886,331	899,333
1888	879,868	882,639
1889	885,944	880,579
1890	869,937	838,059
1891		866,377
1892	897,957	855,388
1893	914,542	874,672
1894	889,242	855,388

The births in France to every thousand inhabitants have been as follows :—

YEARS.	INCREASE.
1770-1780	. 380
1801-1810	. 325
1811-1820	. 316
1821-1830	. 302
1831-1840	. 289
1841-1850	. 294
1851-1860	. 267
1861-1870	. 245
1871-1880	. 220
1880-1890	. 194

The number of children per marriage has been as follows :—

YEAR.					RATE.
1800-1815	3'93
1816-1830	3'73
1831-1835	3'48
1836-1840	3'25
1841-1845	3'21
1846-1850	3'11
1851-1855	3'10
1856-1860	3'03
1861-1865	3'08
1881-1885	3'03
1886-1889	2'16
1891	2'1

Out of every hundred families in France the average number of children are :—

18	None
26	1
24	2
16	3
16	4 or more.

The increase per 1000 inhabitants has been :—

YEAR.					RATE.
1806	12.8
1821	3.3
1831	4.4
1841	4.1
1851	2.2
1861	6.9
1871	8.5
1881	4.1
1891	6.8

The yearly increase now per 10,000 in the following countries amounts to :—

United States	260
Germany	115
United Kingdom	101
France	26

Mulhall gives the following number of births to a 100 marriages :—

	1861-80.	1881-85.
England	407	420
Scotland	447	439
Ireland	520	540
France	304	305
Belgium	408	418
Holland	422	470
Denmark	360	376
Sweden	414	408
Germany	—	439
Russia	—	500
Norway	—	430
Switzerland	—	398
Italy	—	440
Austria	—	419
Hungary	—	404

Taking the standard of 100 as the birth-rate of the following countries, Nitti gives the following figures :—

	ITALY.	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	ENGLAND.	BELGIUM.
1873	100	100	100	100	100
1878	98	96	97	100	99
1885	101	93	94	87	95
1890	100	87	92	81	92

He also gives the following figures of the number of legitimate births to every marriage in France :—

1800-15	4'24
1816-20	4'08
1836-40	3'26
1856-60	3'04
1881-85	3'03
1886-89	2'96

and also the birth-rate for a 1000 inhabitants in the following countries :—

	1874.	1876.	1878.	1880.	1882.	1884.	1886.	1888.	1890.
Italy	34'9	39'0	35'9	33'6	36'9	38'9	36'9	37'6	35'9
France	26'2	26'2	25'3	24'7	24'9	24'9	24'1	23'2	21'9
Germany	40'1	40'8	38'9	37'6	37'3	37'2	37'0	36'6	35'6
England	36'0	36'4	35'6	34'3	33'7	33'3	32'4	30'6	30'2
Scotland	35'6	35'6	34'0	34'0	33'3	33'7	32'9	31'3	30'4
Ireland	26'6	26'7	25'4	24'7	24'1	24'0	23'3	22'9	22'3
Austria	39'7	40'0	38'6	37'7	39'1	38'7	38'0	37'9	36'7
Hungary	42'7	45'1	42'2	45'9	43'9	45'2	44'9	43'6	40'6
Belgium	32'6	33'2	31'5	31'1	31'2	30'5	29'6	29'1	28'7

	1874.	1876	1878.	1880.	1882.	1884.	1886.	1888.	1890.
Holland . . .	36'1	36'8	35'8	35'4	35'1	34'9	34'6	33'7	32'9
Sweden . . .	30'7	30'7	29'7	29'4	29'3	29'9	29'7	28'7	28'3
Norway . . .	30'6	31'6	30'9	30'6	31'1	31'2	31'1	31'0	30'6
Denmark . . .	30'9	32'6	31'7	31'8	32'4	33'4	32'6	31'7	30'6
Spain . . .	—	—	36'2	35'6	36'2	36'8	37'2	36'7	—
Roumania . . .	47'8	30'6	26'3	31'9	35'2	37'5	39'6	40'9	38'0
European Russia	50'4	49'6	46'4	48'7	50'6	50'4	48'5	—	—
Massachusetts .	28'3	25'5	24'7	24'8	24'9	25'4	25'4	25'9	—
Connecticut . .	25'3	23'5	22'3	22'2	19'5	20'5	20'8	21'8	—
Rhode Island .	24'8	23'3	24'0	22'1	24'0	24'0	24'5	24'2	—

The average yearly number of births per 100 inhabitants of the following countries amounts to:—

United Kingdom	3'25
Italy	3'70
Prussia	3'87
Bavaria	3'94
Saxony	4'17
Austria	3'88
Hungary	4'18
Switzerland	3'08
Belgium	3'21
Holland	3'56
Sweden	3'04
Spain	3'57
Greece	2'88
Roumania	3'04
Russia	4'95
Poland	4'23
France	2'58

The births per 1000 in the year 1891 were, in the following countries:—

France	22'6
Switzerland	30'1
Denmark	31'2
Norway	31'4
Belgium	32'1
England	30'4
Germany	38'2
Russia	50'4

In the year 1891 the average number of children to a marriage was, in the following countries:—

Germany	5'25
England	4'79
France	3'31

The natural increase of population, *i.e.*, the excess of births over deaths, is in

Europe	1'06 per cent.
England	1'37 „
Spain	0'48 „
France	0'16 „

The rate of population to square mile is in

Belgium	461
England and Wales	389
Germany	205
France	181

Mr. Schooling writes in the *Pall Mall Magazine*: “When this century opened, France had a population of 27,000,000 to 28,000,000. We, in 1801, were under 11,000,000 in England, Wales, and Scotland, with say 4,000,000 more in Ireland. In 1891 France's population was 38,250,000, and the population of the United Kingdom was also over 38,000,000. In 1896, a census year for France, our population is from 39,000,000 to 40,000,000; and the result of the French census for April, 1896, shows a population of only 38,250,000; so that during the course of the century, and before its close, this country has turned the 1801 home population of about one half of France's 1801 population into an actual majority.”

“The population of France amounted in 1881 to 37,672,048; in 1891 to 38,343,192, an increase of 671,143 only. In England, during the same period, the increase amounted to 2,855,435, in addition to those who had emigrated, amounting to 604,182.” (Whitaker.)

On this question of the decrease of population in France, *The Times* remarked so long ago as 1883: “The explanation of the strange increase of sterility in France is, that the doctrine of Malthus is put into practice there in a way and to an extent never contemplated by the author.”

In consequence of the alarming depopulation occurring in France, a very curious phenomenon is taking place there. She has actually to import foreign labourers to do the work of her own country, which there is not a sufficient number of Frenchmen to do. Belgians, Spaniards, Italians, English, and Germans are pouring into France, and are receiving her wealth in return for their labour. Commenting upon this certain fact, Leroy Beaulieu says that this influx of Europeans, great as it is, is not sufficient, and that if the French nation continues

to practise Neo-Malthusianism as it is now doing, recourse to the Chinese will have to take place. In this manner that silent invasion is coming about in France which Mille writes about and deplores. Marberg says there is constant immigration taking place from Belgium, Germany, and Italy into France; and to suit his Neo-Malthusian tenets, he actually regards this as an excellent thing, provided that the vicious class is kept out. He quite forgets that all the time France is being robbed by them for the sake of their relatives at home, and denationalized. There is plenty of wealth in France, but there are not sufficient numbers of Frenchmen to produce it. "It is curious, but it is manifestly the case, that France is decaying and diminishing, not by the pressure of poverty, but by the selfishness of individual prosperity." (Lyttelton.)

France is the only country in Europe which now possesses fewer able-bodied men than in the year 1860. With reference to the United Kingdom, the numbers are (these and the following are given by Mulhall):—

	1860.		1890.
United Kingdom .	7,530,000	...	9,730,000
France .	10,890,000	...	10,844,000

The number of men per 1000 in France of the following the best age was:—

	1851.	1861.	1866.	1874.	1876.	1881.	1891.
Between 15 and 60 .	618...	619...	617...	606...	610...	608...	596

There is a marked decline in the number of the men and women of the best age. The ratio is per 1000:—

	1851.		1881.		1891.
Men between 15 and 55 .	291	...	281	...	270
Women „ 15 and 45 .	232	...	223	...	214

The number of men between the ages of fifteen and sixty enumerated in France were:—

1881 .	:	:	:	:	:	11,366,304
1891 .	:	:	:	:	:	11,217,636

It can be observed from these figures how greatly France is deteriorating. On the other hand, the numbers of the same ages were, in England and Wales:—

1881 .	:	:	:	:	:	7,375,874
1891 .	:	:	:	:	:	8,374,521

During those ten years France had decreased in men of the best ages by 148,668. On the other hand, England and Wales had increased by 998,647. If this rate of decrease

continues, the collapse of France is easily within the powers of calculation.

In the year 1857 the number of foreigners resident in France amounted to about 10 in every 1000 of the total population; it now amounts to 30. Mollinari also sees no harm in this, but rather a gain, in order to suit his Neo-Malthusian views. He does not even attempt to prove that the universal adoption of Neo-Malthusianism by France is caused by poverty. All he seeks to prove is that it brings more luxury to each individual. No less than 18 per cent. of the small increase of the population of France consists of foreigners. The decreased death-rate can account for a good deal more; hence it can be imagined how much the French nation pure and simple tends to increase. The nationalities of foreign-born in France were:—

	1872.	1891.
Belgians	347,558	482,261
Italians	112,579	264,568
Germans	39,361	100,114
Spaniards and Portuguese	52,954	80,842
Swiss	42,834	78,584
Dutch	17,077	37,149
English	26,003	36,134

The last available French returns, 1891, give the number of naturalized Frenchmen then living in France to be 170,704. Of foreigners resident in France there were then:—

Belgians	465,860
Italians	286,642
Germans	83,333
Swiss	83,117
Spaniards	77,736
English	39,867
Luxemburgers	31,248
Russians	14,357
Austrians	11,909
Dutch	9,078
Other Europeans	9,705
Americans	11,582
Africans	813
Asiatics	343
Others unknown	5,131
Total	1,130,072
In 1851	379,289
In 1886	1,126,531

Gosselin stated that there were in France, in the year 1851, 378,000 foreigners working for their living; in 1881, 1,000,000. Whitaker states that there are now 1,130,111. Writing on this silent invasion or infiltration, Dr. Joire says: "Our fertile country and our restricted population will be invaded by overwhelming German mobs, as the barbarian hordes overcame and absorbed worn-out Rome." Frary writes: "Our sterility is a wave whose effects are slow but sure. We shall be one day powerless against invasion and totally helpless against infiltration. A nation which decreases in the midst of Europe as we are doing is condemned to quick disaster." See also Cheysson in "*La Question de la Population en France, et à l'étranger.*" For very many years France has considered wealth to be the great desideratum. Events are teaching her, as all political economists know, that men are the truest and best possession; without them wealth cannot be produced.

The Daily Graphic, in its recent articles on alien immigration, told us that in each 10,000 of our own population it amounts to 58; in Germany to 88; in Austria to 172; in France to no less than 297. Frenchmen are at last waking up to the havoc and ruin which Neo-Malthusianism would inevitably bring upon them. The Anthropological Society of France has taken up the matter very warmly, and is warning Frenchmen that if they will persist in practising artificial checks to procreation as they are doing now, they will certainly bring about the degeneration, as well as the depopulation of their country. There are many Frenchmen at last beginning to see that a small number of children now must mean a small number of producers in the future. Moreover, the great and continual increase of population in Germany is causing great uneasiness throughout France. "At present the French economists, almost without any difference of school or method, attack the premisses and conclusions of Malthusianism, so severely falsified by the present condition of France." (Nitti.)

It has had the effect of the French Government issuing an order that education and board should be given to every seventh child in necessitous families. In 1890 the Academie des Sciences wanted to give the father of a family two, three, or four votes according to its size. Lord Acton, the Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge,

in his first lecture there, on June 11th, 1895, gave utterance to the following very remarkable statement: "Soon after 1850, several of the most intelligent men in France, struck by the arrested increase of their own population, and by the telling statistics from further Britain, foretold the coming preponderance of the English race."

And now I venture to add some extracts from the writings of distinguished Frenchmen, who, perceiving the ruin which the practice of Neo-Malthusianism has brought upon their country, have been obliged to leave their opinions on record.

Jules Simon: "Our families are dwindling away; our country is dwindling with them; our race is doomed. But to be sure, we shall be able to afford a luxurious burial."

Guyau, who has admirably written on the interesting question of religion in connection with the fecundity of races in *L'Irreligion de l'Avenir*, condemns Neo-Malthusianism as economically disastrous, morally dangerous, and fatal to civilization. Dumont says the great evil which now menaces all civilization is the voluntary limitation of the family. Leroy Beaulieu, the most distinguished political economist that France now possesses, writing so recently as January, 1896, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* on the commercial superiority which Germany is attaining over France, says that if these positions are to be reversed, a great change in the habits of the individual Frenchman and family life in France must take place, especially in the latter.

Writing in the *Economiste Francais*, March 13th, 1880, "Question de la Population en France," Guyot says: "The birth-rate in France is eighty per cent. lower than in England or Prussia. Does this arise from a plethora of inhabitants? Is there no room on French soil for one Frenchman more? On the contrary, the specific population of France is scanty compared with her territory. In France, taken in her entirety, it is not a daily ration of bread, but a certain amount of comfort. Now there are two ways in which this comfort may be gained and preserved, either by doubling one's efforts, or by reducing one's burdens to a minimum. Most Frenchmen prefer the latter course. We blame the imprudence of the spendthrift who brings children into the world without having the means to maintain them in it, but the prudence which refuses to undertake the duties of paternity for fear of the burdens which they entail is a grave

symptom of moral inertia. The spring of life and energy must be broken in a man who, instead of acting, makes it his aim to avoid action. The exaggerated application of Malthus' principles threatens little by little to destroy the French nation." He says that one-fifth of the families of France have no children.

See also what Levasseur writes in his great work, *The History of French Population*; also what he writes in his preface to Schöne's work on the same subject, and how he comments on the silent invasion now taking place in France. Bertillon: "It is necessary that the rearing-up of children—three at least—be considered as a kind of impost." Richet: "If anyone takes, for example, a list of the members of the Institute of France—senators, deputies, generals, professors—it can be seen how small is the number of their children. Many of them are celibates. Some, although married, have none. Many have only one, two, or three at the most. Very rarely is this number exceeded. If the general birth-rate of France was equal to that of the middle class, in two hundred years there would not be a single Frenchman left. France, increasing in numbers less quickly than England, Germany, Russia, and the United States, tends to become a second-rate power. There is the national peril. The day will come when France, surrounded by powerful and jealous neighbours, will not be able to defend herself; and if this diminution of the population goes on, she will fall into the seventh rank. And this will take place because France has the lowest birth-rate of any other country in Europe. Such is the brutal, incontestable, certain fact. It is not a natural sterility which is the cause; it is a voluntary one. What everybody thinks about we say out boldly. Middle class, peasants, workmen in town and country, every Frenchman more or less, has given himself up to this absurd and culpable habit. Rich and poor wish to have few children, and they have but few children. It is not chance, nor impotence, nor infecundity of the race which is the cause; it is the result of calculation that the French have so few children." "The stagnation of our population is the greatest of our perils; it is the peril of the future. We must look for remedies. We shall without doubt find them. We must apply them at all cost." (Frary in *Le Peril National*. See the whole book.) He begs his countrymen "Laisser faire la nature et la volonté de Dieu." See also Deschaume's

recent book, *La Banqueroute de l'Amour*, in which he writes of the "women who have submitted to surgical operations that render motherhood for ever impossible, and which are said to be of criminal frequency in this same Paris. Adding these to the families which have no children, he foresees the time when a real husband and wife will be known only as modelled in bronze, and kept in some Musée de Cluny." He attributes the present depopulation of France to nothing else but the voluntary prevention of conception.

"Every child you do not have is one man the less, and that man might have been a Papin, a Watt, or a Stephenson." (Letourneau.) Palisse: "We can scarcely attribute to anything else but an excessive care for money, and a forethought pushed to timidity, some very disquieting facts in our marriage and birth-rates in France. I will merely recall, by the way, the continually decreasing excess of our births, which, if not stopped by radical social reforms, can only end in our final decay. The fear of marriage and the family is now the particular feature of the French nation." Another writer: "The continued diminution of the birth-rate in France has gradually and necessarily led French biologists, economists, and social writers to abandon all the prejudices and standards of Neo-Malthusianism." Professor Mivart says that France was not in earlier times exceptionally unproductive, and the France of former days, still surviving in Canada, is not so now. I give the statistics:—

TABLE OF FRENCH CANADIAN POPULATION, 1765-1891.

CENSUS YEAR.	FRENCH IN CANADA.	RATE OF INCREASE.	FRENCH IN UNITED STATES.	TOTAL.	RATE OF INCREASE. PER CENT. PER DECADE.
1765 ..	69,812 ..	—		69,812	
1784 ..	98,012 ..	—		98,012	
1805 ..	215,000 ..	—		215,000	
1822 ..	310,000 ..	—		310,000	
1844 ..	538,213 ..	—		538,213	
1851 ..	695,947 ..	—	(1850) 531,749	749,696	
1861 ..	880,902 .. (1851-61) 26'4		(1860) 102,260	983,162	(1851-61) 30'6
1871 ..	1,005,200 .. (1861-71) 14'2		(1870) 201,871	1,207,071	(1861-71) 23'0
1881 ..	1,186,008 .. (1871-81) 18'0		(1880) 325,989	1,511,997	(1871-81) 25'38
1891 ..	1,304,745 .. (1881-91) 9'7		(1890) 500,000	1,804,795	(1881-91) 21'64

In the *Annals of the American Academy* for September, 1896, Professor Davidson, writing on "The Growth of the French Canadian Race," states that there are at the present time more French Canadians in the United States than there were in the whole of Canada sixty years ago. In 1850 there

were only 53,000 French Canadians in the United States; in 1890 there were half a million.

"Some hasty economists have attempted to ascribe the diminishing birth-rate to the slight fecundity of the French race. But they forget that this race was very prolific in the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries. From 1715 to 1789 it increased from eighteen to twenty millions."

The cause which undoubtedly gave birth to the widespread adoption of the artificial check system throughout France was the Napoleonic law which decreed the equal division of land, at the death of the owner amongst his children. The father, loth to see his real property subdivided, decided that he would have but one child to leave it to. Frenchmen refused to adopt the English principle of colonization as a remedy for over-population. They chose the more pernicious one of restricting the number of their children, with the evil results which they are now witnessing on all sides. Schöne writes, that if the peasant could safely will the field and cottage to his eldest son, he would be less inclined to act contrary to nature and the will of God.

Unfortunately the practice of Neo-Malthusianism seems to be rapidly increasing in England. I mentioned previously that we would, under the heading of Population, examine into some of the evidence which seems to be accumulating on this point.

One of the most distinguished medical authorities in England, one most competent to give an opinion, writes to me, in answer to a question I ventured to put to him, as follows: "I have no doubt that prevention of conception is greatly increasing in England amongst the better classes. I think it is the exception to find families which are unlimited among those classes, and in most cases this is due to prevention of conception. Morbid fear of pregnancy is very common." Dr. Strahan writes: "I can remember the time, and that not so very many years ago, when no respectable woman would have dared to have ventured such matters to her medical attendant. Now it is the everyday practice to ask the family doctor's advice as to the varying efficacy of the various means commonly in use, and to make unblushing inquiries as to better and more modern weapons. In fact, the state of things is fast becoming as bad in this country as it has been for some years past in either France or America. Ask any medical man in practice among the middle and upper classes,

and he will tell you that the married woman among his patients who is not fully alive to these practices is the *rara avis*. Some women have too high a sense of morality to sink to the level of their sisters in this respect; but assuredly these are in the minority, and in a minority which is decreasing daily." He quotes the figures from the Registrar-General's Report, and says they speak for themselves:—

YEAR.				PERSONS MARRIED PER 1000 LIVING.		BIRTHS PER 1000.
1864	.	.	.	17'2	...	35'4
1874	.	.	.	17'0	...	36'0
1884	.	.	.	15'1	...	33'6
1894	.	.	.	15'1	...	29'6

Although the marriage-rates in 1884 and 1894 were identical, yet the birth-rate has actually fallen 4'0. "From a dispassionate survey of the foregoing facts, it would appear that within a limited number of years England will find herself in the unenviable position which France occupies to-day. The evils to which I refer have been growing for years past, their nature causing them to be winked at rather than dragged into public view for condemnation; and, as a consequence from familiarity, society has come by degrees to tolerate, and even to look upon with favour, conduct which aforesaid it would have scouted with abhorrence." Another distinguished doctor writes: "I have no doubt of the existence on a large scale of limitation of families, nor that in selfish hands it does great harm. Families are now widely limited, and this is rapidly increasing." The birth-rate affords very cogent and forcible evidence. This has decreased in the United Kingdom from 34'8 in 1876 to 28'9 in 1894. This decline is as rapid as that which has taken place in France.

One of the best known and widely read of English journals says: "We often hear it said that the decline of the population in France is a sure sign of national decay. Moreover, we trace the cause to the canker immorality, which is slowly eating away the life of that nation. The Registrar-General's quarterly returns for England and Wales point to the suspicion that here, too, things are not as they should be. The birth-rate is unquestionably decreasing. Thus, in the first quarter of 1896 it was 29'1, as compared with an average for the ten preceding quarters of 31'7. In Huddersfield it has actually fallen to 19'3. We would fain believe that the diminution of

the birth-rate is due to a decrease in improvident marriages, and the growth of a manly self-restraint. But the open profession of immoral sentiments, in which we seem nowadays to be contesting the palm with other nations, forbids our entertaining the belief."

I have examined into the extraordinary decline of the birth-rate which took place at Huddersfield in the first quarter of the year 1896, and I am assured by competent authorities that it can be principally traced to the prevalent use of artificial checks.

It is quite clear that the average number of children to a marriage has decreased in England. The ratio of the increase of the population in the United Kingdom is as follows:—

1861 to 1871	8·8
1871 to 1881	10·8
1881 to 1891	8·2

The Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton, writing in *The Economic Review* on this subject of population and Neo-Malthusianism, remarks that there must have been some diminution of births to a marriage, or a postponement of it altogether, to account for the great fall in the birth-rate which undoubtedly has taken place. Some cause or causes, he says, must be at work to account for so alarming a decrease, which seems to be affecting the whole country, and checking the rate at which, for the greater part of the century, our population has been growing. He examines into the possible causes of this declension. He says that there can be only four:—

(a) An increased death-rate. This is obviously not the case.

(b) Increased emigration. This may account in a small degree for it, but is wholly insufficient for so great a decrease as there is.

(c) A decreased marriage-rate. This is the case undoubtedly, but also is not wholly sufficient to account for either.

The marriage-rate in England was per 1000:—

1873	8·8
1886	7·1
1891	7·8
1893	7·4

(d) A diminished birth-rate.

After an elaborate discussion of all the above possible causes, he comes to the conclusion that the chief cause is the

latter, and upon it he gives utterance to these grave and weighty remarks: "If the natural relationship between the sexual instinct and the increase of the race be severed in England as the French nation is severing it, if the interests of the individual and those of the race are dissociated, we shall see in our own country, as in every other which adopts Neo-Malthusianism, an ominous combination of individual prosperity with national decadence. If this system is adopted in England—which there seems a likelihood of, unless better counsels prevail—it will surely bring with it dangers greater than any which Malthus descried as the results of overpopulation; and, unlike them, these dangers are not merely foreseen or imagined, but are actually visible by the light of contemporary experience." Foreign writers, commenting upon the great decline of the birth-rate in England, unhesitatingly declare it to be caused by the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. Mayo Smith writes: "It is hardly possible that the decrease of the birth-rate in England has been brought about by lack of food, for that would certainly have had some effect on the death-rate. There must have been some psychological causes, inducing married people to have a less number of children." Mille, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, examines likewise into the causes of this decline, and says: "There only remains one; it is, that husband and wife have restricted the number of human beings who could have been called into life." Marshall, in his *Principles*, says: "In France for a long time, and recently in America and England, some of the abler and more intelligent of the working-class population have shown signs of a disinclination to have large families, and this is a source of danger." And yet, notwithstanding all that has arisen in France with regard to the habitual adoption of Neo-Malthusianism, notwithstanding all the outcry of learned Frenchmen themselves against its practice, and the overwhelming arguments raised by them to prove the disastrous results which it must have in France if persisted in, there are some English writers who still maintain that its adoption would be effectual in relieving the excess of population in England. It is about time they should be brought to see their folly. In no respects whatever is France superior to England, whether in general prosperity or morality; notoriously the latter is not the case. All those who uphold the true principles of love, morality, and honour, and who are interested in the

population question, must have been glad when the *Church Times* quite recently published the following: "One of the saddest features of our day is the hurrying on of the French nation to self-destruction. Would that some prophet might arise to recall men to their allegiance to first principles.

"Unhappily, however, the tendency just now is the international communication of vice and falsehood. The untruth which makes men regard family obligations as things to be avoided, and that would present life as a round of pleasure first, and duty a long way, a very long way, afterwards, is rapidly spreading in England, threatening to become as dominant here as for years it has been across the Channel, and with the same inevitable result—the destruction of the nation through the ruin of the family. We are almost stupefied at times as we survey the evidence, strong and trustworthy, which, gathered from all quarters and directions, tells of the rapid and thorough disintegration of true family ideals in England, and especially amongst the great middle class, which forms the backbone of the nation. Our astonishment at the facts is only equalled by our surprise at the names of men of influence and position who not only countenance the evil we have in mind, but think they are doing a service to humanity by their action. Is there no prophet who will arise and condemn this abomination of desolation? There are amongst us men who know, and whose knowledge, put into strong, stirring words, would command attention; but they are silent. There are others, leaders in church and state, in politics and literature, who appear not to know, and who, if they do not know, are culpable for their lack of penetration. Not a single bishop or other dignitary of the church have we heard of as attempting to grapple with the devastating policy we have in mind, a policy welcomed by the indolent and lovers of pleasure, and encouraged by men who profess to speak in the name of (un-) natural science. That some of our higher clergy are aware of what is becoming an accepted condition of family life we have reason to know: all the more is their attitude to be regretted. Masters of statistics might speak if they would, but they too are silent.

"We have passed some severe strictures of late on certain schemes and methods of work allowed and indulged in by churchmen, lay and clerical, which unquestionably tend to

weaken the place and importance of family life as the basis of national well-being. Our strictures have derived strength from the conviction that, all unconsciously, well-meaning churchmen have, by the methods condemned, helped to further the ends of those destroyers of society who teach that parental responsibility is quite undesirable beyond a certain limit, and that the proper end of marriage is sensuality. Against that view of the constitution and work of humanity we must do unceasing battle.

"Our war against the low view of the family which regards a small family as a higher blessing than the many children of Divine promise, is on the same footing as our antagonism to all forms of church work, clerical or lay, which in any way interfere with or lower the dignity of family life and parental authority and responsibility."

Unfortunately, from the colonies also comes a similar report, that the birth-rates are also declining there. "The whole business of the reproduction of the species does not show itself in its best light here. In Victoria, for instance, there is a steady diminution in the proportion of children born to a marriage, which the officials can only trace to the increasing desire of married women to evade the cares of maternity; and the same tendency is to be observed in all the provinces, except South Australia."

From the United States comes similar information. That country also seems to have widely adopted the pernicious custom of Neo-Malthusianism. Large numbers of tracts, etc., advocating the system, come to us from there. This is plainly not caused by any pressure of poverty, or the lack of territory, but simply arises from the disinclination of married women to bear children.

That Neo-Malthusianism is largely in practice there admits of no doubt whatever. I am told it now runs France hard. Dr. Billings ably deals with the declining birth-rate in America in the columns of *The Forum* for June, 1893. He has gone more deeply into the matter than anybody else who has preceded him, so he is the more competent to express an opinion. His views of the matter are rendered the more valuable inasmuch as they are carried down to the present moment, and moreover, being a medical man, he has a wider knowledge of the matter than any non-professional person or mere compiler of statistics could have. He was Medical Inspector for the

army of the Potomac, Curator of the Army Medical Museum and Library, Director of the Laboratory of Hygiene for the University of Pennsylvania. He was also in charge of the division of vital statistics of the tenth and eleventh censuses; and is, besides, the author of a great many learned works. His experience, therefore, has been about as wide as anybody's could have been, and it has rendered him peculiarly competent to express an opinion upon these matters.

First, he tells us that the birth-rate per 1000 in the United States has fallen from 30·95 in 1880 to 26·68 in 1890; that is, equal to a little over 4 per 1000. He gives us general examples of the fall throughout a varied and large extent of territory in the following table. He also most wisely gives the coloured as well as the white decrease:—

BIRTH-RATES PER 1000 OF POPULATION.

STATES.	WHITES.			COLOURED.		
	1880.	1890.	Loss per 1000.	1880.	1890.	Loss per 1000.
Alabama . . .	37·96	31·32	5·64	37·86	29·25	8·61
Arkansas . . .	42·74	34·65	8·09	41·04	31·48	9·56
Florida . . .	34·06	28·09	5·97	35·20	28·60	6·60
Georgia . . .	35·70	29·45	6·25	38·05	31·30	6·75
Louisiana . . .	34·36	29·99	4·37	36·14	29·16	6·98
Maryland . . .	29·24	25·24	4·00	36·04	28·28	7·76
Mississippi . . .	36·63	30·13	6·50	38·74	30·07	8·67
North Carolina . . .	35·29	29·79	5·50	38·99	30·13	8·86
South Carolina . . .	34·23	28·75	5·48	39·63	32·63	7·00
Tennessee . . .	36·26	30·38	5·88	40·42	31·28	9·14
Texas . . .	40·73	31·53	9·20	40·79	30·33	10·46
Virginia . . .	32·85	26·53	6·31	37·70	28·08	9·62
Total . . .	30·95	26·68	4·27	38·50	30·22	8·28

Only four States show an increase. These are

	1880.	1890.
Arizona	19·21	24·94
Colorado	21·51	25·09
Montana	22·45	22·81
New Mexico	33·42	34·08

Then he proceeds to compare the birth-rate of the United States with that of certain European countries, and he proves that a similar declension is taking place in them as well as in his own country, but that it is greater there than in Europe. The proportions per 1000 for 1880 and 1890 have been in the following countries as follows:—

	1880.	1890.
United States .	36'0	30'7
England and Wales	34'2	30'2
Scotland	33'6	30'3
Ireland .	24'7	22'3
France .	24'5	21'8
Belgium .	31'1	28'7
German Empire	37'6	35'7
Austria .	38'0	36'7
Switzerland	29'6	26'6
Denmark	31'8	30'6
Norway .	30'7	30'0
Netherlands	35'5	32'9

here, in this table, we are confronted with the certain fact that nearly every civilized country in the old world, as well as the United States, is reducing in numbers. From the North Cape to the most southern shores of the Mediterranean, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, throughout two continents, human life is dwindling away, owing to the use of artificial checks to conception. Dr. Billings gives the world the causes why this declension is taking place. The reasons for coming to the conclusion he has are so forcible, so fraught with interest to the future of population over the civilized world, that I venture to give them here *in extenso*. They are just as applicable, be it remembered, to any country of Europe as to the United States. The conditions of life there are much the same as in Europe, and human nature is pretty much the same all over the world. After minutely discussing the various changes in the birth-rates of Europe and the United States, he proceeds as follows:—

“Does this diminution in birth-rates indicate a progressive diminution in fertility, in the power of either or both sexes to produce children? There is no good reason for thinking so. It is true that it has been suggested that alcohol, tobacco, and syphilis are producing a deterioration of races which is in part responsible for the change, but of this there is no evidence. So far as we have data with regard to the use of intoxicating liquors, the fertility seems to be greatest in those countries and among those classes where they are most freely used.

“Is the lessening birth-rate due to changes in the mode of life of the people, such as the progressive increase of migration from the rural districts to the cities, the increase of wealth and luxury, the so-called ‘emancipation of women,’ etc.?

“No doubt these things have some influence, by diminish-

ing the proportion of marriages at comparatively early ages, and by favouring an increase in divorce and in prostitution; but it is probable that the most important factor in the change is the deliberate and voluntary avoidance or prevention of child-bearing on the part of a steadily increasing number of married people, who not only prefer to have but few children, but who know how to obtain their wish. The reasons for this are numerous, but I will mention only three.

"The first is the diffusion of information with regard to the subject of generation by means of popular and school treatises on physiology and hygiene, which diffusion began between thirty and forty years ago. Girls of twenty years of age at the present day know much more about anatomy and physiology than did their grandmothers at the same age, and the married women are much better informed as to the means by which the number of children may be limited than were those of thirty years ago. To some extent this may also be true as regards the young men, but I do not think this is an important factor.

"The second cause has been the growth of the opinion that the abstaining from having children on the part of a married couple is not only not in itself sinful, or contrary to the usual forms of religious creeds, but that it may be even, under certain circumstances, commendable.

"The third cause is the great increase in the use of things which were formerly considered as luxuries, but which have now become almost necessities. The greater temptations to expenditure for the purposes of securing or maintaining social position, and the correspondingly greater cost of family life in what may be called the lower middle classes, lead to the desire to have fewer children, in order that they may be each better provided for, or perhaps, in some cases, from the purely selfish motive or desire to avoid care and trouble, and of having more to spend on social pleasures.

"In the struggle for what is deemed a desirable mode of existence at the present day, marriage is being held less desirable and its bonds less sacred than they were forty years ago. Young women are gradually being imbued with the idea that marriage and motherhood are not to be their chief objects in life, or the sole methods of obtaining subsistence; that they should aim at being independent, if possible, of actual husbands, and should fit themselves to earn their

own living in some one of the many ways in which females are hoping to find increasing sources of remunerative employment; that housekeeping is a sort of domestic slavery, and that it is best to remain unmarried until someone offers who has the means to gratify their educated tastes. They desire to take a more active part than women have hitherto done in the management of the affairs of the community, to have wider interests, and to live broader lives than their mothers and grandmothers have done."

He also gives us the information that the voluntary prevention of conception was far more extensively practised, previous to the year 1880, in the Northern and Eastern states, but that since that year it has widely spread throughout the Southern. When I wrote upon the causes of Neo-Malthusianism in Europe I had not read Dr. Billings' famous article; but I am glad to observe that he corroborates what I ventured to assert were the causes generally speaking throughout human nature for its practice, namely, a craving for luxury, and selfishness. Both these vices combined are now threatening to break down all moral society throughout the old and the new worlds. Dr. Billings concludes his remarkable article with these words: "Considered as one of the signs of forces which are at work to modify the existing conditions of society, and some of which appear to be of evil tendency, the diminution of the birth-rate merits careful consideration by statisticians, sociologists, politicians, and all who are interested in the physical and moral well-being of the inhabitants of this country."

I am quite well aware that close observers of what is taking place in America with regard to the declension of the birth-rate ascribe it more to the general practice of abortion, which is very prevalent there, than to Neo-Malthusianism. Indeed, Dr. F. Napheys writes as follows: "The detestable crime of abortion is appallingly rife in our day; it is abroad in our land to an extent which would have shocked the dissolute women of pagan Rome. The crime is common; it is fearfully prevalent. Hundreds of persons are devoted to its perpetration; it is their trade. In nearly every village its ministers stretch out their bloody hands to lead the weak women to suffering, remorse, and death. Those who submit to this treatment are not generally unmarried women who have lost their virtue, but the mothers

of families, respectable Christian matrons, members of churches, and walking in the better classes of society. Testimony from all quarters, especially from New England, has accumulated within the last few years to sap our faith in the morality and religion of American women. Both Bishop Coxe and the Roman Catholic Archbishop Spaulding have issued Pastorals upon this great crime." Well, whichever vice is the most prevalent, the effect on the moral nature of the women and the nations is the same.

And now I think I have written as much as can conveniently be written, in what must necessarily be a somewhat confined space, upon this question of Neo-Malthusianism, the causes which have brought the system into being, and its results. One thing only now remains to be remarked, and that is, that after having carefully examined most, if not all, of the European and American literature on the matter, I observe that those Neo-Malthusians who at first warmly took the matter in hand and advocated its general adoption through evil and good report, have, after the example of Mrs. Besant, receded from their original position. They have at length been obliged to admit that the monster which they helped to raise would certainly devour the whole nation, and cause havoc and ruin to morality in all directions. This is satisfactory. The crucial example of France, and the effects of voluntary prevention of conception there, have proved too much for them; and they have at length been obliged to come to the only possible conclusion, namely, that this system merely substitutes one evil for another.

"Neo-Malthusian doctrines are of a most retrograde character. So far from tending to the welfare of the human race, they tend to the steady deterioration of it. They would, in the natural course of things, bring us back to a class of plutocrats, on the one hand, few in numbers, but possessed of superior natures and plenteous wealth, and, on the other, a continually augmenting class of the poor and the degraded, with all the dangerous elements that follow from this class being sufficiently numerous to swamp those who belong to the nobler race." (Father Clarke, S.J.)

I will now proceed to mention those reforms in existing institutions which would, without much difficulty or revolutionary process, be able to cope more successfully with our excess of population than Neo-Malthusianism could ever do.

THE EXCUSES FOR NEO-MALTHUSIANISM REMOVED BY A REFORM IN GENERAL EDUCATION

TO be effectual in dealing with a generally congested state of population, education must be fair to all alike—to the professional, as well as to all other classes. This is not so now. The tradesman and the very poor enjoy free education, but the struggling professional classes in a higher social grade have to pay for it, and it is very often an immense struggle for them to do so. This is certainly not fair to all alike. We know very well that many of those who receive a free education for their children in National and Board Schools enjoy far larger incomes than very many professional men who have to pay for their children. Under the system of free education for all classes, Eton and Harrow, and such-like schools, could go on just as they do now, with this difference only, that the education in them would be free. Classification could be carried out just as it is now. The aristocrat would have no cause to fear that his son would be soiled by contact with the poor man's; Eton young gentlemen could still revel in as much expenditure as they pleased. All schools would, under such a system, become the property of the State, and the education throughout them all should be identical, thus enabling the poor boy to have the same opportunity of advantages as the rich one. Under the present unequal system, the schools to which the poor boy is fain obliged to go cannot afford to pay the best teachers; hence they are at a grievous disadvantage compared with the rich schools, which latter, after all is said and done, were endowed for the advantage of the poor.

Education should, moreover, be imparted with a clear, definite object. It should train the young of all classes to take the places most suited for their tastes and skill in all the

professions and trades which produce the wealth of the country. It should be given for a much longer time, and with much more special object, than it is now. At present it is carried out in the merest haphazard fashion. The only real education, the only really useful one, is to mould the character into a useful one. At present this special education is merely looked upon as something to be tacked on after the ordinary school time is over.

Let us deal more particularly with the classes which issue forth from our National and Board Schools at much too early an age. Everywhere the evidence is that the boys and girls turned out under the present system are almost useless for the work which they are to perform in life, notably agriculture. It is very sad to see lads and girls leaving country schools totally ignorant of technical agricultural knowledge, which would be most useful to them, and create an intense interest in country life. The system pursued to-day has nearly always the contrary effect. It tends to make them dissatisfied with country life. And yet we are all aware that every advance in agriculture and horticulture can only be obtained by scientific knowledge. It is not I alone who condemn the lack of agricultural knowledge in those who ought to have it imparted to them at an early age. Hear what Sir John Gorst wrote lately on the matter: "If anyone contrasts the elementary and technical instruction imparted to the children of the peasantry in foreign countries and in England, as well as the amounts spent by their respective Governments thereon, there is no reason for surprise at the defeat of English agriculture; and it is impossible to refrain from asking whether better education of the people would not tend more to the relief of agricultural depression than remedies like bimetallism or protection. The understandings of all those who are connected with the cultivation of the soil appear to be darkened. The landowners exhibit that dislike to intellectual development which is characteristic of a territorial aristocracy; the farmers regard the imitation of their forefathers as the highest agricultural art, and scoff at the teachings of science; and the labourer's children are turned out to scare crows when eleven years old, and often, by the connivance of the school-attendance officers, who are under the thumb of the farmers, at a much earlier age. After leaving school the children get no further instruction; they have no means of keeping up the

little knowledge they have obtained, and in a few years they forget everything they have learned, and are often incapable even of reading and writing. How can such a population compete with the French agriculturist, carefully trained in schools and colleges in the art they are to practise?"

It is of the utmost importance that those who are intended to cultivate land or gardens should be instructed, at least in the elementary principles which are so necessary for their successful cultivation. See the present type of agricultural lout turned out of our schools, the despair of everybody. What does he know about the culture of land, fruit, gardening, bees, corn? What does he know about the various natures of soils, all of which are so essential to anybody whose calling has to do with country life? In later life, if he is still found on the farm, he has to go to a chemist and pay for such knowledge. Would it not have been better if he had acquired it in early life? The unfortunate boy is ignorant of all this; he has a slight knowledge of reading, which merely enables him to spell through penny dreadfuls, so making him discontented with the quiet of a country life; it is just sufficient to make him gravitate towards the more vicious unrest of the town, into the poor, melancholy, wretchedly-paid, dull monotony of the clerk-life of the city. Yet all the time there is a far happier one awaiting him in the country, if it had only been pointed out to him. "*O fortunatos nimium.*"

If English land is at all to hold its own with foreign, it must be cultivated on scientific principles, not on the absurd and antiquated methods which have hitherto been adopted. As long as technical education in agriculture is neglected, and access to the land where it can be put into practice is denied, any profit from English land will soon become a thing of the past. Boys whose calling it is to deal with agriculture ought to be instructed in its science at school, instead of being, as they are now, turned adrift to make a living out of it as they best can, absolutely ignorant of its most elementary principles. We all know something of the woeful ignorance of the national-school girl of fifteen, just turned out of school. She has a faint glimmering of the three R's, but of cooking and such-like domestic work she is totally ignorant. But which would serve her best in life? "I remember," says a well-known economist, "a little girl who was well up in school history and

geography, but who was astonished at being told that the ground of her father's garden was the surface of the earth." Horses are useless unless properly trained for the parts which they have to play; and so are boys and girls, unless trained for the special trades and professions which they intend to follow in life.

If we compare our present modes of education with those of Germany, we are at once struck by the difference. The German boy's is entirely specialistic, and for that very reason he is ousting the Englishman from almost every field, both at home and in the colonies. He declares what he is going to be, and is brought up to excel in that one direction, and in it he becomes as perfect as he can well be. If he chooses to be a clerk, he is well taught while young the use and advantage of being able to converse and correspond in other languages besides his own, and he strives to make himself perfect in them. The consequence naturally is, that German clerks are far more valuable than those whom we have brought up to be clerks; these know no language but their own, consequently they are at a great disadvantage compared with the foreigner, who has it all his own way. The German boy is not taught to play on the piano, as some of ours are, merely to make a discordant noise upon that instrument, but he is taught how to make one as well as it can be made, which is the most likely to afford him a living when he becomes a man.

Dr. Fairbairn says: "The real struggle for existence has passed from the high seas and battle-fields to the marts of the world. It is industrial competition which holds in its hands the issues of the future; and in this competition victory will go to the qualities which the school alone may not produce, but which cannot be produced without the school—skill and character. The pitiable fear of education in the farmer, or in the mistress, who dislikes a too well-read servant, is, in its essence, the cowardice that would sacrifice the well-being of the state to the convenience of the individual (note Neo-Malthusians); and as this is impossible to us, England must be prepared to spend whatever millions may be necessary on the education of her sons."

It seems évident that, if we are to hold our own in the industrial competition which seems coming upon the nations, increased efficiency of education must take place. But if one class, the absolutely poor one, is to have this great

advantage at no cost to itself, then the professional class above it is placed at a serious disadvantage. Every reform is an innovation on custom. Those who, through long habit and blinded eyes, have accustomed themselves to an injustice, generally see no harm in it, but great harm in the proposed improvement. Free education to all classes alike is a case of this kind. It may seem somewhat startling at first sight, but when closely examined its justice is evident. If it be considered wise and good, both for the individual and the community, that one class should have, without money and without price, what it cannot pay for, it surely follows that all classes which are in the same predicament, or cannot obtain what is the best for them, should have a similar advantage. Free education to all, and the same to all, rich and poor, would be of immense value in removing any excuse for the practice of Neo-Malthusianism by the professional well-to-do class, which has so widely adopted it. No suitable persons would then fear to bring a child into the world lest it should suffer disadvantage by their not being able to educate it. The cost of education can be better borne by the multitude than by the individual.

Another most serious defect in our present system of education is that a poor boy must now leave school at much too early an age. This is not the case with the well-to-do. Why should it be the case with the poor? The gasfitters, the plumbers, the carpenters, etc., should be taught while at school everything belonging to their trades. They require as much time to learn them as the learned classes do theirs. Why should lads, after they have left school, be obliged to learn what they might have done there until the age of nineteen? The fact that they must leave at the early age they are obliged to do now is, of course, caused by the pecuniary demands of their parents, who look upon their children, when they have reached the ages of fourteen or fifteen, as valuable stocks-in-trade to add to the family exchequer. (See Mrs. Batson's book, *Hodge*.) All this is only an additional hindrance to a class which might provide much more wealth if properly trained, for the whole community as well as for itself. It is a miserable short-sighted policy, of course, for the parents to adopt, but they are driven to adopt it owing to the false economic system under which we have the misfortune to live. When the wages of the father are not sufficient to support the

family, he naturally looks for help to the children of his home, no matter how immature they may be in physical or mental power. This is altogether wrong. The son grows up merely to add one more to the unskilled trades. The father is unable to wait for his more matured and trained services, and so he is sent out into the fields to frighten birds, when he might be acquiring knowledge which would in the end be far more productive of wealth for all. The wretched parent is forced to snatch at immediate pecuniary advantages, however small they must necessarily be, utterly regardless of the boy's interests in the future. The result of this forced iniquitous system is that the boy never rises above his father, and so the tendency to a very unsatisfactory level, both for the individual and the nation, is prolonged all round with the most disastrous results to all concerned. We have many instances of this in the manner in which foreign nations, better educated in technical skill and trades than we are, have drawn away much of our trade, especially the Belgians and Germans. We no longer dominate the markets of the world. We have entered into a war in which skill and education are the prime factors, not brute force or wealth. If the report of the Commission appointed by the North of England masters and men to look into the causes of the present competition between England and foreign countries and examine its results be read, it will be found that the better positions of Belgium and Germany are entirely owing to the superior special education which is so lavishly bestowed upon the young of those countries. It is about time we should bestir ourselves in the same direction. Dr. Dillon, writing in *The Fortnightly* on the subject, says: "In Germany love of knowledge for its own sake, apart from its practical and profitable utilization, is studiously instilled and successfully communicated to the rising generation, and the result is writ large, among other things, in the vast strides made by German commerce throughout the world. Their country bristles with technical schools, with commercial training-colleges, and with special educational institutions for every kind of theoretical learning and practical skill—from the method of dairy farming to the theory of transcendental æsthetics." What have we to show as a set-off to all that? Absolutely nothing that can be compared to the systems abounding on the Continent. It is no wonder, then, that we are gradually losing ground in invention and initiative.

In addition to the present unsatisfactory mode of education, there is much unfairness to the children. The law enacts that all of them, *volens volens*, shall be educated. If the development of the brain is necessary, which, of course, it is, it equally follows that the due development of the body, without which the brain is useless, should be helped also. It is certainly mental torture to work a brain while the body is starving. The poor child who suffers from semi-starvation should not be forced to go to school to undergo mental torture, or, if it is, it should be fed by the same power which forces it to go. Mere humanity must admit this principle to be right and just. To insist upon a poor half-starved little girl going through hours of agony is a crime against which human nature must protest. To force a child to learn while it is crying from sheer hunger is downright cruelty. Justice and mercy revolt against such inhumanity. "Teachers vainly try to develop brains ill supplied with blood." (Barnett.) Voluntary efforts are being made in all large towns and cities to provide those children who are in absolute want of food with sufficient to have one meal a day while attending school; but these must necessarily, from the nature of the case, be merely spasmodic, with no certainty of continuity, and quite insufficient. The dinner system is rarely helpful, never thorough, and often merely mischievous. In the year 1890 a special sub-committee of the London School Board reported that, out of the 340,000 children then attending their schools, 110,000, or one-third, had their fees remitted owing to poverty, and of these 43,000 were returned by the teachers as habitually attending school in want of food. For 19,000 of these voluntary effort of some form or another provided some sustenance, but 25,000 were hungry every day. According to the best statistics available now, no less than 51,000 children go to school every day in London alone in a state of semi-starvation. This fact speaks for itself. The time must come when hungry school-children, unless man's inhumanity is to be continued, will have to be fed at the cost of the community. The law says they must go to school, but it is obvious that they are not in a proper physical condition to do so. Either then the law will have to be relaxed in their favour, or it must enact that they must be fed. As I write, a pathetic appeal comes from "The School Dinner Association," signed by Lord Londonderry, appealing for funds to feed the hungry

school-children of London. It mentions "the sorrows and sufferings of little children which it is in our power to prevent." If they were not forced to go to school, there would be no responsibility for their various sufferings upon anybody but the parents. Directly the community steps in and says it is best for us and our welfare that you send these children to school, then at once the community assumes responsibility for their proper condition to conform to its rules. Extreme men say that education means simply to sharpen one's claws that we may fight our neighbours the more fiercely, and destroy them the more successfully. Whatever it be, the child who is forced by an irresistible power to learn should be put into a condition by that power to enable it to do so properly. Surely it must strike home to the consciences of the well-to-do when they see their own children start off to school well fed and happy, and then remember that many thousands of the children of the poor are setting forth for the same place crying from hunger. Rich bachelors and spinsters no doubt would object to free education all round, and to feed the hungry children, forgetting for the moment that the latter is a Christian obligation, but surely it would be better for them to contribute towards these much worthier objects than tailors, hairdressers, and homes for cats and dogs, and other similar miserable eccentricities, upon which they lavish such large sums now. Moreover, in considering this matter, it must be remembered what a great advantage workhouse children have over children outside; the former are taught while well fed, housed, and warmed, which the latter are not. It may be said that to feed hungry school-children would serve as a premium on improvident marriages. These will be treated of later on. It might be so at first, but as soon as proper teaching on marriage becomes the usual custom, not the exception, which it is, alas! now, that tendency would most certainly cease. Moreover, under our present nefarious economic system, our efforts should be mainly directed towards the children's interests, so as to bring about better work in the future; their welfare, with a view to increased productive power, and the race, should be considered first. Would it not be better, by exercising this Christian charity to the children in the time of their severest need, to build them up healthy, capable of maintaining themselves as men in later days, than to maintain the present system of being half

starved as children, and then thrown into the workhouse as men to die, at a great cost to England and Wales alone of poor-rate amounting for the year 1895 to £9,866,605; themselves in number, the wretched paupers, to 789,288. Surely it would seem best to the most superficial understanding to stem the evil before it had taken root, than to leave it until it had arrived at dimensions rendering any aid almost useless. If these poor starving children were properly treated when young they could learn more, and not grow up rickety and scrofulous, merely to fill pauper lunatic asylums and such-like places. Max Nordau asks us, with a great deal of truth and force, which is the best for a nation, to maintain huge unproductive armies and navies, or to feed our hungry children? The Christian ought to have no difficulty in answering that question. No question causes more opposition than this one of feeding hungry children obliged to go to school. It is communism. It is destroying all parental responsibility. But Mrs. Barnett tells us that "play-rooms for children, clubs, gymnasia, swimming-baths, must be supplied, if need be, at the cost of the State." The fact is, that although providing hungry school-children with sufficient food may, under present conditions, be open to objection on the ground that it would tend to make the idle parent idler, and the drunken parent more drunken, yet it is better to undergo these disadvantages of the State-feeding system for a short time, than that the child, the future producing power, should be hindered in growing up to be an advantage to the community. Another dreadful result of a lack of proper education is the present problem of the unemployed. To this they owe much of their miserable existence. Their origin is to be found in the unskilled labour market, which is the happy hunting-ground of the capitalist, who profits by the frightful competition within it. "When a capitalist has the choice of a great number of working-men, he will choose that one who will work most cheaply." (Turgot.) Mr. Hobson, in *Problems of Poverty*, tells us that it is this unskilled labour market which provides the victims of the sweater. This problem of the unemployed is now one of the most important before the English people. We live in the richest country of the world, wealth abounding amongst a certain class; yet, on the other hand, we see thousands upon thousands of men standing all the day idle, enforced to do so against their

wishes, longing for work, yet unable to get any. Surely here is a state of things which urgently calls for a remedy. Mr. Hobson, I think, has at last hit upon one in his work, *The Problem of the Unemployed*. He shows us that one great cause is, that the capitalist, by laying up his possessions and not expending them, tightens the work of the nation, which, if he did otherwise, might be very considerably expanded. In this direction lies a possible help, but in that of a skilled education all round lies the surest. It can very readily be seen what a great part a proper system of technical education can be made to play in dealing with a seeming superabundance of population and in reducing poverty. It is quite evident that those who are ignorant of skilled work are entirely driven out of the field by those who have had the advantage of proper training. We see a remarkable instance of this fact in the case of the Army Reserve man. Notice a number of men at work. You will be certain to observe that the mere hewer of wood, the drawer of water, the mason's and plasterer's helps, are all Army Reserve men, earning but the lowest wages. During all the time which they might have been acquiring skilled knowledge of a trade, they have been kept at unproductive work with the colours. Hence, when they return to civil life, they are unable to do anything better than the commonest and rudest of unskilled work. They are of necessity obliged to be mere diggers or helpers to the skilled artisan. They have failed through adverse circumstances in the battle of life. They have been hindered from learning a useful and well-paid trade in their younger and best days—the necessary time—and now they are cast out to compete with others incomparably their superiors. Those who love to have large standing armies may learn something of their unproductive work from this fact. Another grievous injustice in this matter of education can be noticed.

Centuries ago, kings and clergy founded great colleges and schools for the sole benefit of the poor, who could gain in them all the learning which they might wish to obtain, with no expense to themselves but that of mental effort only. Now we see all these priceless advantages swept from them in all directions by the well-to-do, who have no exclusive right to them. It is the same with regard to scholarships, which were originally intended for poor, not rich men's sons. But now the latter,

being enabled, through possession of wealth, to obtain the best education which can be got, carry off all these educational prizes for their sons, and oust the poor man's, who cannot afford to obtain the best education for his son. In this way many a bright and promising lad is kept down by the unfair advantage of wealth, and the lack of similar education all round. Every boy should be given equal opportunities of improvement; until that is done, it is nonsense to say that we are all on a par so far as education is concerned, and that the Chancellorship of England is in every boy's knapsack. Here in this particular instance—alas! only one out of far too many—may be seen the unfair advantages of wealth. Surely only honorary scholarships should in the simplest justice be allotted to the rich, and the emoluments arising out of them granted to the poor. Those who are staunch Tories, of course, do everything in their power to oppose every measure which might be calculated to improve the education of the masses, and in doing so they are logically correct. Everybody who, by the power of education, is issuing out of the ranks of the masses must hold Liberal views. Mental cultivation must cause him to be dissatisfied with low, unjust, and unsatisfied conditions of life and surroundings, and he naturally seeks by every means in his power to remove them, and rise into a higher position. New objects and desires are elucidated in him, but he plainly sees that under present conditions and hindrances they are incapable of attainment.

A great writer says: "The first effect of education upon the masses is naturally to increase the general sensibility to the many disabilities of their lot." But it is in this matter of education, free and open to all, that freedom and peace will be obtained, that everybody will be able to work up his way towards the goal of improvement. Surely this is better than the violent, revolutionary excesses which some more ardent and fiery spirits fondly think they would reach it by. Peaceable endeavours, like free education to all classes alike, will be of more durable benefit than a general scramble for imaginary benefits.

And now, in the course of considering the good effects which education in its most complete, possible form would be likely to have in removing difficulties out of the way of a large population, we must necessarily discuss the effects which education undoubtedly has on fecundity. This is one

of its most serious and important aspects. It seems to be the rule that the more intellectual power there is the less fecundity. We were reminded the other day by one of our great journals that a very large proportion, perhaps the majority, of our greatest intellectual giants have died childless, and of those who had any children, a large number predeceased their parents. Few of the greatest names in literature, science, or art are to-day borne by direct descendants. The families of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, Cowley, Buller, Dryden, Pope, Cowper, Goldsmith, Scott, Byron, and Moore, are all extinct. There is no direct descendant now living of Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Drake, Ussher, Cromwell, Hampden, Monk, Marlborough, Clarendon, Addison, Swift, Walpole, Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Burke, Canning, Disraeli, Bacon, Locke, Newton, Day, Gibbon, Macaulay, Hogarth, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Nelson. And the journal goes on to say that all these great names are mere reminiscences, no one of them borne by a descendant; and in those cases where the name is yet extant, it is borne by a collateral relative, or has been adopted by a distant connection. "A surprising number of the ablest men have left no descendants." (Galton.)

It by no means follows that when there is no issue of a marriage the wife is to blame; frequently the husband is sterile. Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Newton, and Locke had only six children between them. It must have been an extraordinary coincidence if they had all married sterile women. Ritchie tells us that the longer a man's family has existed the less likely he is to have inherited any of the ability of its founder. Prussia is the only country in the world which has minutely studied the fecundity of marriage in accordance with the profession of the father. Here we find that artists, literary men, and learned professors have the smallest number of children. (See Mayo Smith on this point.)

It seems to be the rule that the more the brain and nerve power is drawn upon, the less powerful become the generative instinct and capacity. Spencer declares that cerebral development hinders fecundity. Greg writes to the same effect in *Malthus Notwithstanding*: "In other words, that the species will put on more of the philosopher and savant, and let the animal die; that more books and theories will be produced, and fewer children." Graham and Proudhon say that increase

of mind decreases generative power. Gide and Richet say that as intellect increases population will most certainly diminish, for all intellectual work consumes the generative capacity both in the individual and the race. Education at the expense of animal fibre introduces many twists and wrinkles into the brain, which increases by exercise, while the body is weakened. We have many remarkable instances in lower animal life of this fact, namely, the power of mind over body, and the opposite. Walker, in *Beauty*, shows us how all animals in which sexual instinct is very strong and powerful are invariably very deficient in mental power and activity. We have only to observe the cases of the mole, the toad, the goat, the boar, and the donkey, to testify to the truth of this. We must also remember, in our own sphere of animal life, the overpowering sexual instinct of the unfortunate idiot; he, as all attendants on such cases sorrowfully know, is a prey to his animal passions. On the other hand, Foret tells us that the increase of intelligence in the ant has led to the sterility of the workers. The latter are a very remarkable instance of the power of mind over body. For countless ages the ant has been a worker in the industrial field, and the result of it is, that those who have worked their little brains most have become absolutely sterile.

We may yet have to learn or unlearn a great deal about the increase of population from the case of the ant. We can readily imagine that the increase of intellectual power, bringing refinement in its train, would be very likely to reduce animal propensities. Coarseness, animality, gross passions, are not, generally-speaking, found amongst highly intellectual types and organizations. Marshall says: "Education and the habit of using the mind tend almost certainly to diminish the producing power. There is only a certain fecundity of force in the female frame, and if that force is inverted, so to say, in one way, it cannot be used in another." This seems unquestionably to be the case. Women who are intellectually inclined, and who cultivate their minds, are, generally speaking, very cold-blooded, without warm affections—not quite the objects to which man's love goes out. They do not wish to marry, and maternity is a dreaded thing to them. They would do well to refrain from marriage; they are doing wrong in reproducing lives like their own. The more that women work their brains, the less becomes their maternal

power, and consequently they shrink from undergoing what is to them going down into the valley and shadow of death. Who could be so cruel as to wish them to marry and bear children? Those women who happen to be intellectually powerful, but physically weak, are bound, in duty to the lives which they would be most likely to bring into existence, to refrain from marriage and maternity. In this direction a very considerable reduction of population would take place. Education, by weeding out women unfit to be mothers, causing them to dislike and forego maternity, will doubtless prove a valuable aid in reducing the pressure of too large a population. Gide says that the fecundity of the human race will very materially decrease, without anything immoral being done, in proportion as the intellectual and moral improvement of individuals increases. What is to the savage woman, who has no intellect, but a matter of a few hours, is to the intellectual product of civilization prolonged misery and frequent death. The higher we seem to advance in evolution and civilization this matter of maternity seems to become more arduous and difficult. Increased pain and danger seem to accompany child-birth whenever the intellect of the mother is beyond the ordinary standard; the greater the power of the brain, the less the power of the womb. Such is the universal opinion of all those who have studied the subject. Dewey says that it is chiefly the lack of suitable physical exercise that causes the French girl to grow up to be a woman to whom child-bearing is a torture, when not a danger to life itself. This physical inferiority after marriage becomes a motive, working most powerfully on both husband and wife, to avoid the conception of children. The time seems very likely to come when plain but healthy girls will be sought after by men for marriage much more than pretty ones; the latter would be likely to condemn the men they married to nurse a suffering wife always stretched on a sofa. All women who shrink from maternity, and readily withdraw themselves from the operation of that mysterious law without any remorse and suffering, but rather with satisfaction, certainly admit themselves to be incomplete in their organization, and deficient in that special function of their being. Nature tells them that they are unfit to become mothers, and they should sternly relinquish any idea of it. But their later years will not be such as healthy women of body and mind would be at all likely to envy. They

become miserable, hypochondriacal, and nervous. To be alienated from woman's natural desire is no punishment to them, but very much the contrary. They are nature's nuns, and should be treated as the Romans treated their vestal virgins. Miss Glyn writes on this point as follows: "Civilization brings its cross as well as its crown; and the high pressure of modern life, which tends to shatter the nervous system, must inevitably intensify the perils of motherhood, and render them a thousand-fold more formidable. Motherhood amongst the animals apparently carries no feeling of dread. It has been left for civilized man to commit those excesses which have transformed the once natural and comparatively easy process of maternity into a dreaded life-and-death struggle." Upon this I venture to remark, that it is somewhat difficult to comprehend how lower animals could acquaint us with the fact that they have no dread of maternity, and also how unfortunate man has increased the peril of child-birth, and also when child-birth was "comparatively easy." Miss Glyn must disbelieve the sentence which was passed upon her sex: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." I have already dealt with the cases of those women who are not unfitted by nature to bear children who accept offers of marriage, and yet refuse to have any. Writing upon this question of women's intellectual achievements with reference to the health of the children of such women, one of the wisest women of the day writes (she must be nameless): "The intellectual culture of our women is one cause among many of the present degeneration of health. The more a woman's mind is cultivated, the less fit she is for the function of maternity. The mind can only be developed at the expense of the body, and, therefore, at the expense of any other organism to be formed from the body. The refined and intellectual woman brings children into the world at terrible cost to herself; and they can only derive from her a physical system of more or less delicacy, which, insufficient as it is, has taken away strength from the mother that can probably never be replaced. The child so produced is most likely to inherit a nervous system conducing to great intellectual development, but with still less prospect of a healthy offspring in the next generation." Many of the wisest physicians of the past and present declare, that by advocating women's intellectual improvement we are most

seriously injuring them in their most vital point, their own health, and also depriving the unborn of the sound constitutions which ought to be theirs. Of all the blessings which a man and wife can transmit to their children, that of a sound constitution is the greatest; but if women persist in working their brains to too great an extent, their unfortunate children will not rise up and call them blessed. A strain on the nerves of women tells most adversely on their children. What is hysteria in the first generation becomes insanity in the second. (See on this point Jacoby, *Studies on Selection*; De Candolle, *Essay on Selection*; and the writings of Delauney, as well as those of many English authors.) Everyone who has studied the subject knows beyond the shadow of a doubt that women of great mental activity are always infertile, for activity of the brain is always acquired at the expense of the bodily vital powers, but where the latter are in full force the brain power is small. Great, powerful, tall men are always stupid. Frederick's grenadiers proved that. The more active the brain and nervous system is, the less is the physical power of the body. This in women especially prevents the proper development of generating power, consequently women of genius are always infertile. This fact, as women become more and more highly educated, will tell largely on population. Women will be able to choose which they will indulge in, books or babies. Thousands of years' experience has unquestionably proved that women are designed more for activity of heart and emotions than for intellectual capacity. Whatever certain women may say, marriage is a woman's natural profession, and any other is exceptional and unnatural. A married woman's life is far healthier than a spinster's. The former has in her children the natural outlet for her emotions; the latter seeks something to love. She is driven to it by her nature, and finds in pets like cats, dogs, and monkeys miserable substitutes for joyous children. The same in the cases of childless married women. "The reproduction of the species is in woman the most important object in life, almost the only destination to which nature has called her, and the only duty she has to fulfil in human society." (Richerand.) "Love is but an episode in the life of man; it is the whole history of the life of woman."

"Love is of man's life a thing apart;
'T is woman's whole existence."

In an interesting article on the evolution of the family in *The Monist* for July, 1896, Dr. Tropinard tells us that to all female animals family is a necessity; to the male a luxury. From the moment she is capable of reproduction, the object of her life is one thing—love. The demand for women's education, which contradicts all the natural aspirations of the sex, would not have arisen except for the adverse economic condition which compels her to earn her own living, and which is altogether contrary to her proper condition.

This very important question of women's education and intellectual activity reducing fecundity, and increasing deterioration of children's health, is occupying a great deal of attention in American medical literature. Dr. Cyrus Edson writes: "Expressed in the fewest words, the evil is that an increasingly large proportion of the women of the American race are unable to perform their functions as mothers, and these women include the mentally-best we have among us. The gravity of the evil confronting us lies in this, that we seem to be able to bring the women up to a certain point in mental development, and then they cease to be able to be mothers." Alluding more particularly to the practice of Neo-Malthusianism in America, he says: "I once heard a married woman say women are growing very scientific in these days. It is a fact that a very large number of American women now refuse to bear children. Ideas have changed. The religious sentiment, which forbids efforts to prevent the accomplishment of the natural function of their sex, has been greatly lessened in force for many of them. To no class in the community is the realization of what is going on so vivid as to physicians, because to them the sufferers, from the results of their own acts, must come for relief. It is almost useless to point out the terrible consequences of this interference with nature, or to say the exchange of pain during a short period is avoided, and pain during life secured. So far as the act is a result of a dislike to be deprived of the pleasures of society by the care of children, it is damnably wrong. So far as it results from the dread of pain of child-birth, it is folly so absolute that it may not be expressed in words. But when it is the result of an innate feeling that there is not stamina enough to stand the strain, what then? If the system of education prevents American women having children, and if the influence of those women is strong enough to put a stop

to any change in that system, or if those women refuse to be mothers, American men will, so far as they can, marry girls of other races. In time there would gradually permeate through the minds of men the understanding that health was a requisite in the women they would make their wives. Healthy girls, girls with stamina, would then have the same advantage over their less fortunate sisters that is now possessed by the pretty girls over those that are ugly."

We have sufficient grounds, then, for believing that women who possess intellectual powers, and who delight in giving them the freest scope, are not fitted to perpetuate the race, if, indeed, they desired to do so, which they do not. Books, not children, are their pleasures and enjoyments. This is a matter which the advocates of the higher education of women must take into serious consideration sooner or later. If it should be the intention of nature by largely increasing the intellectual power of women there should be less generation, and that by this means population, having served its ends, should decrease, well and good; if not, and that the higher education of women inevitably means their own physical deterioration, as well as that of their children, when they happen to have any, terrible results are certain to ensue, one of which will be the numerical decay of the nations which would encourage such women. Compare the Celtic wife, Scotch or Irish, on her native hill-side—magnificent in physique, with flowing tresses, the mother of six or eight healthy children, splendid in proportion, limbs perfectly modelled, smiling and happy in the enjoyment of perfect health—with the unmarried woman, the product of civilization—pale, nervous, hair scanty and short, spectacled, a book in her hand; and then say which product, that one of nature or that one of civilization, ought to be the type of woman which should prevail in the future.

Those of us who are interested in women's questions, and, wanting to know what women are thinking and saying about them, attend socialistic meetings at home and abroad which are addressed by women, must be very much struck with the mental power of the women of all nationalities who speak at them. Their physical appearance, however, is disastrous. Keen, vigorous in mind, ready and perfectly competent to give replies to most able questions, they exhibit very remarkable intellectual powers. But judging from the

sparkling eyes blazing with light, the quivering figure, the nervous tension, the short hair, the spectacles, they certainly present about the very last specimens which one would be likely to choose to be mothers. In accordance with their natures, such women loathe the idea of maternity, and are unquestionably right in refraining from it.

If what we familiarly term nature and natural sexual instinct are mere animal propensities, to be escaped from by the mentally-cultivated, and left to be indulged in by the more or less idiotic, then by degrees the race, becoming gradually more and more intellectual, will become extinct, and Terra will become similar to her satellite Luna. Is increased brain-power and intellectual activity arranged so as to bring procreative energy to an end? A very long period, however, must elapse before the animal type of mankind will be impelled by educational impulse to bring itself to self-extinction. "Furthermore, the effect of education, for instance, in reducing sexuality will tell most where it is least wanted, namely, among the best types." (*Evolution of Sex.*)

At the dawn of history we find that the race which then dwelt in the valley of the Nile was the most developed in mental power of all other races then on the earth. At that period the men who lived in the north of Europe were mere savages, but great in animal power. In course of time, through developing mental power to the utmost, the Nile race became extinct, and the savage one took its place. That one has now in its turn developed equal mental superiority. Is the same process to be repeated? Is some future development of the present Central African savage destined to stand on London Bridge and gaze on a decayed civilization, as we gaze now on that of the Nile valley? Many most thoughtful observers of the increased demand for the higher education of women at the present day attribute it to economic influences, and say that if these had not been adverse to the natural custom of marrying and giving in marriage the question of the higher education of women would not have arisen; that in an ideal society women would have been too much occupied with their proper cares—their children—to have either wished for or attempted anything outside the sphere of maternity. One thing is certain. It is only within the last twenty-five years that the demand for women's

education has arisen, and that coincides with the advent of an increased population and its inevitable accompaniment—pressure of competition. Hence women are called away from their natural domestic sphere to undertake duties which are detrimental to their nature and best physical interests. Up to twenty-five years ago no women of any nation in the whole world ever attempted to take upon themselves the work and duties of men. History plainly tells us that when women confined themselves to their natural duties they were far happier than they can ever be under different conditions. Close observers say that all these questions of women's rights, etc., are merely the unnatural desires of unmarried women, who are forced by lack of marriage into an unnatural condition of mental disturbance. "Love and marriage are the only normal conditions of women's life. Without them both men and women for ever miss the best part of themselves. They suffer more, they sin more, they perish sooner." (Napheys.) Very carefully-prepared statistics prove that between the ages of twenty and forty-five more unmarried women die than married, and no remarkable longevity in a spinster has ever been recorded. Hufeland says that to live long one must be married. In France, Bavaria, and Prussia, Napheys says that out of five insane women four are unmarried, and that throughout the whole civilized world the rate is three or four unmarried women to one married. In Belgium, Mulhall says there were lately only 813 insane married women to 3394 unmarried; in Italy fifty-eight married to 100 unmarried. Professor Mivart says: "I deem the married state to be the best for the vast majority of women." In consequence of marriage being unattainable through want of means and pecuniary pressure at home, women are driven into the markets of the world to seek their bread in competition with men, some with their brains and some in the factory. All this is inverting the laws of nature. Far too many girls say, "I cannot starve; I must either work my hands or my brains; I must do something to earn my living." It is wholly unnatural, and most certainly detrimental to their own health and the physical welfare of the race. It is a natural law that men should struggle with each other in many of the pathways of life, but women should not. It enfeebles them and their children. Sir J. F. Stephen cynically wrote on the liberty, equality, and fraternity which

can be witnessed in the present unequal struggle between women and men. When women have to fight with men in the industrial market with their hands, their bodies must inevitably fail. If they do so with their brains, nervousness, hysteria, and all their attendant maladies follow as a matter of course. And yet numberless writers of the day, both men and women, unite in congratulating themselves and the world upon the opening-out of many more "fields of labour" for women, upon the many more "trades and professions" which are now being entered into by them in which they can "earn their living," and how thankful we ought to be that such is the case. We ought rather to grieve at the shocking necessity there is for women to work. The only "fields of labour" which ought to exist for women are their homes, the only "profession or trade" marriage. For those who have a vocation for it, nursing is the only profession outside the domestic one which women ought to undertake. That affords an outlet for their love and affections. That gentle women should have to turn out from home in the cold of winter, or in the heat of summer, to work, is a disgrace to men and society. Christianity abolished and overcame slavery. Its next most wholesome work would be to raise women out of the bonds of toil and exhaustive labour. The present struggle to live is bad enough amongst men; but between men and women it becomes doubly hurtful, and trebly so, for it injures the children. Women's greatest attraction ought to be their helplessness, which appeals so touchingly to man's tenderest side, and even the savage felt it. He hunted, he worked, for the wife and children at home. "*Domi mansit et lanam fecit.*" The husband went out to seek the food, thus fulfilling his natural part, and the wife remained at home and ruled the household; but now the woman fights for her food against the man, and so all is chaos. With moil and toil of arm and brain, gentle women are driven to work against the man by taking lower wages. Yet their Creator intended the woman to be the weaker vessel, to be a helpmeet for the man, and always to seek his aid and protection. Cruel, merciless competition drives her to work in leadworks, which are detrimental enough to men, but to women simply appalling in their pernicious effects to health. On no account whatever should child-bearing women be allowed to work in factories, or indeed anywhere. Statistics prove beyond all doubt that the

rate of mortality amongst children of the women who work during pregnancy is enormous. The wages of the breadwinner are not sufficient to maintain the family ; hence the mother is compelled to work, thus injuring the breadwinner of another family. The fact is, that women working in factories lower their own physical powers, and also degrade the moral and chivalrous nature of the man. As for the little they earn, all who have paid serious attention to the matter unite in declaring that they would be better off, even from a pecuniary point of view, if they remained at home. Jalin's report from Belgium, and Wright's from America, amply prove this. Max Nordau says that when this dreadful competition between men and women becomes worse, all gallantry will be lost, and women will be unmercifully dealt with and crushed. It will become a genuine wrestling-match, and there can be no doubt which will have to succumb first. How differently the poet wrote of men and women's work—

“Thy husband's one that cares for thee ;
And for thy maintenance commits his body
To painful labours, both by sea and land,
To watch the night in storms, the day in cold ;
Whilst thou liest warm at home secure and safe.”

The census of 1891 tells us that out of the female population of the United Kingdom no less than 1,840,898 were employed in industrial labour of some sort, 1,759,555 in domestic service, and 52,026 in agricultural pursuits. The two latter, of course, nobody can object to. It is the work in the factory which means such great physical exhaustion to them. Mr. Hobson says that the number of women engaged in trades has been gradually advancing during the last four decades, and that now it amounts to over two millions ; also that their most sedentary occupations, and the longer hours they work in many cases outside the operation of the Factory Acts, makes the evils of overcrowding, bad ventilation, bad drainage, etc., more detrimental to the health of women than of men-workers.

If women had been able to remain at home and carry on their proper vocations there, these modern questions, with regard to the education of women and unnatural callings for them, would not have arisen.

In addition to the barrenness of offspring, which we have

ample grounds for believing higher education brings about, there is to be added to it another most serious result, that of increased suicide. It is a certain fact that self-destruction is far more prevalent amongst highly-educated nations than in ignorant ones. Saxony is the best-educated country in the world, and there we find the highest rate of suicide in the world; while Ireland and Portugal, the most illiterate, have the lowest. During the year 1893 the number of suicides in the following countries were, per million :—

Saxony	340
Denmark	253
France	218
Ireland	24

In France, we are told, the rate is terribly increasing, but in others it is about stationary. The rates in France have been, per million :—

1830	51
1840	82
1850	103
1860	112
1870	133
1880	178
1885	205

In cities, Paris has the highest rate. The figures are at present, per million :—

Berlin	.	.	170	Naples	.	.	60
Brussels	.	.	271	New York	.	.	144
Copenhagen	.	.	302	Paris	.	.	422
Dresden	.	.	240	Rio Janeiro	.	.	60
Florence	.	.	76	Rome	.	.	53
Frankfort	.	.	344	St. Petersburg	.	.	206
Genoa	.	.	64	Stockholm	.	.	272
London	.	.	85	Turin	.	.	110
Milan	.	.	133	Vienna	.	.	287

(Mulhall).

It is a most curious fact that the rate according to other countries practically remains the same. If in highly-educated nations an increased rate of suicide is to be accepted as an indication that people, after having received the best education possible, then find that it makes them dissatisfied with life in consequence of not being able to satisfy the new desires

which have been evoked in them by education owing to repressive economic conditions, there is much scope for fear and imagination of what increased education may involve the world in. A strong disinclination to live is becoming more and more perceptible every day. Suicide by the young is becoming far too common an occurrence. They seem to flinch from the struggle for life, to shrink from having to undergo the daily repugnant task which is the unhappy lot of far too many. Mr. Hobson says that by striving to educate the poor we have made them half conscious of many needs they never recognized before. They were once naked and not ashamed, but we have taught them better. We have raised the standard of the requirements of a decent human life, but we have not increased to a corresponding degree their power to attain them.

Again, if suicide be taken as an indication of want and misery—and all economists unite in affirming this—France has an unenviable notoriety, as she ranks third in the list. It would consequently seem that she is not in the very flourishing condition which the Neo-Malthusians would try to persuade us she is. Morselli says that France annually loses through suicide 7896 men in the prime of life; Prussia, 4096.

The connection between education and suicide is, of course, easily discernible. Education makes men feel very acutely the horrors of failure. This has much more effect upon an educated than an uneducated man, upon a refined brain than upon one which is of a lower and coarser type. Among savages and idiots suicide is very rare. Among the Chinese it is very common indeed; but the cause in that country is, of course, the miserable government under which they have to live. The effect which education has on promotion of suicide can also be explained by the fact that mental development brings greater increase of insanity, nervous disorders, and greater sensitiveness to mental and physical suffering. (See Mayo Smith on this point.) Morselli and Wagner, the two greatest authorities in the world on suicide, clearly show how nervous development and suicide invariably increase side by side. We all know very well that a very refined, highly-bred person suffers far more pain, both in mind and body, than one of a lower type does. A coarse, brutal man will undergo an operation without anæsthetics, and suffer very little; a highly-sensitive, nervous person would die under it. A bird or

animal will move about and seem very little the worse for a gunshot wound which would instantaneously kill a human being. For instance, how frequently one sees a pheasant, wounded in the air, fall with a tremendous thud to the ground, and yet instantly run away, and give a man a difficult task to catch it. The fact is, that the more refined animal life becomes, whether by education, selection, or surroundings, the more insanity and nervousness it develops. Witness the cart-horse and the thoroughbred, the ploughman and the refined aristocrat of letters, the dairy-maid and the educated lady of a thousand years' inherited selection and refinement. Insanity, the result of nervousness, is the unnatural heritage of education and refinement. It is the heavy price which we have to pay for surrendering our purely animal type. For instance, for 52 peasants who become insane, no less than 525 persons of the learned professions do so.

We are all aware also of the well-known fact how constantly, under these two potent factors, old families die out. Refinement and education have married refinement and education for centuries, and the result is nervousness, insanity, and barrenness. The peerage and the family become extinct. They are only kept from their fate by marrying into a more animal type occasionally, which enriches, by a healthier strain, that one which was worn out. It brings it back into a healthier, more natural, invigorated condition. Maudslay, in his *Physiology of the Mind*, tells us that the last members of an old family are nearly always consumptive or insane. Too refined breeding tells its own tale. Darwin says that 450 per 10,000 marriages among the nobility of England are consanguineous, being six times the average of such marriages in England; and 19 per cent. of the English nobility are childless, more than three times the average for England. "Our aristocracy, by exclusive intermarriage among ancient families, proceed blindly to breed in contempt of deformities, or feeble intellect, or of hereditary madness, under the instigation of pride, or the love of wealth, until their race becomes extinct." (Sir A. Carlisle.)

The proof that brain and nerve development produce insanity can easily be seen in the case of savage races. In them insanity is of the very rarest occurrence; in fact, it may be truthfully said to be non-existent. In them there is no worry, no wear and tear of life, no strain on nerves and brains;

animality is triumphant, and consequently insanity is unknown. It is rapidly increasing in all civilized countries, but in the races where savagery still exists there is not the very slightest indication that such is the case. In the animal stage of man's existence insanity cannot gain an entrance; it is the product of civilization. Those who think will naturally ask themselves, is all this nervousness, insanity, and infertility of women caused by advanced education, a rebellion of nature against interference with its laws? Insanity amongst lower animals is unknown. It certainly seems to be an evil production of increased mental attainments. If evolution by mental selection is to lead future generations to a general condition of insanity, we may well have compassion upon them. As we all know very well, there are many who believe that all mental ability is nothing but the genius of insanity, or a form of epilepsy; in other words, that to be clever one must needs have a dash of insanity in his blood.

If we take it by itself, nature revolts against education. About one child in a thousand learns from the pleasure of acquiring knowledge, and that child learns with pleasure merely from heredity—the result of one of its ancestors having acquired that taste. Mental power is not a product of nature itself, it is a habit acquired mostly in opposition to nature. Take the case of the average boy, and we all know how irksome and disagreeable it is to him to acquire knowledge, but how naturally the chase, the sports, the games come to him, and what a delight they are. Our natural bent is to return to nature, not to rise out of it; whatever is done in that direction is against the grain. Nature plainly informs us that it abhors education and mental development, and she punishes those who break her laws by inflicting upon them infertility, nervousness, insanity, and suicide. All lower animals, and even vegetable life, seem to be included in this category. We are all well aware of the infertility of highly-bred animals and plants. The more we bring them out of that condition in which nature has placed them the less is their fertility. We have a very curious instance of this in the case of very highly-bred pigeons. Every pigeon-fancier knows that high-class breeding of pigeons has a tendency to reduce the food from pigeons' crops most suitable for young pigeons, and therefore they keep common pigeons to provide it for them. In zoology higher productions are very infertile, the

inferior very much the reverse. We know the great difficulties we have with regard to flowers in this respect also. Villey points out to us that the rose in its natural condition has only five petals, but it multiplies very rapidly. When cultivation perfects it, and the stamina are changed into petals, the development proceeds at the expense of fecundity, and it can only be reproduced by planting fresh trees. The Neo-Malthusian might then find, in promoting education by every means in his power, a remedy for an excess of population. The more education, the less fecundity; so the future need give him no cause for alarm. "Another important commentary on Malthus' Essay, which subsequent study has brought into prominence, is suggested by the reflection that we have not yet arrived at a full knowledge of the physiological laws which govern the increase of population. There may be relations between the nervous strain, which often accompanies a higher standard of national comfort and intellectual acquirements, and the growth of population which have not yet been completely disclosed and investigated." (Price.)

So far then as our arguments have led us on this matter of education, we can gather that our evolution by force of education means that in the future we have to expect nerveless, effete men and barren women. As time goes on, each person who is raised by education out of the less cultured classes will add one more to the infertile; in due course all will be absorbed into that class; they themselves in the course of mortality will pass away, and leave nobody to take their places. Or will the opposite be the case? Will mankind learn in time that the intellectual type is contrary to the nature and feelings which the Creator has implanted in the human race? Education, then, may well have its terrors as well as its advantages so far as population is concerned.

The question we all, I suppose, ask ourselves sometimes is, Does civilization improve the physical condition of human life? It cannot be said that it does. If we compare what our armies have done when engaged in battle with savages—and it is a very fair test—we can easily see that if our men had been armed only as savages were they would have been massacred to a man, they would have had no chance whatever. The plain fact is, that the nearer the man is to the animal the better is his physical condition. If the water of the stream be purer nearer its source than at a distance from it, it

naturally follows that man must be in better physical condition nearer his origin. Even if we take into account all the inventions of civilization, it is very questionable, as Mill said, if they have lightened human toil in the least degree. It seems to be the unerring law that the longer man lives upon the earth the greater are his wants, the greater is his expenditure of mental effort, the greater is the strain upon his nerve force. Shall we, after all, be obliged to acknowledge the truth of Holy Scripture, "that in much wisdom is much grief, and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow"?

It would be well for us to bear in mind these words of Fouillée : "On compte annuellement dans l'ancien monde environ trois cent mille fous, dont la majeure partie se trouve en France, en Allemagne, et en Angleterre, dans les pays de plus grande activité intellectuelle."

THE EXCUSES FOR NEO-MALTHUSIANISM REMOVED BY A REFORM IN MARRIAGE

THOSE who wish to study the great and complex problem of population must first study that of marriage, its only legitimate source amongst civilized nations. Whatever may have been the custom amongst primitive savage races—there are many different opinions held by competent authorities—promiscuous intercourse, under the influences of an advancing civilization, soon disappeared. Some say that promiscuous intercourse was never the rule amongst the higher anthropoid apes or mankind in its most savage state. All close observers of the habits of the orang-outang, the gorilla, and all anthropoid apes existing in present times, declare that promiscuous intercourse is not their custom. The male is accompanied by three or four females only. Many affirm that the anthropoids are monogamous. This question can be studied in the interesting works of Starcke, *The Primitive Family*, Letourneau, *The Evolution of Marriage*, Westermarck, Tylor, McClennan, etc. Sir Henry Maine shows us how promiscuous intercourse always ends in sterility, and that primitive man soon found this out and stopped it. Dr. Carpenter also tells us that slave-owners in early times also had to prevent it, in consequence of the slave women becoming totally infertile. An additional proof of this is that prostitutes are always infertile. “Il ne passe pas d’herbe dans les chemins où tout le monde passe.” In the case of the sterility of these women nature gives us an indication of her healthy working. They are bad types of humanity. Generally-speaking it is the soft, easily-led girl, a weakened product of humanity, who gives herself up to prostitution. If the supply was not kept up, the class would die out in the first generation. It must be remembered that there was no such custom in primitive times as prostitution. Every man had a wife or wives; every

woman a husband. It is the result of what we too frequently and inaccurately term an advanced civilization. The women themselves loathe the life. No girl adopts it for love's sake, but to gain a living.

“Old, ere of age, worn-out when scarce mature,
Daily debased to stifle my disgust
Of forced enjoyment in affected lust,
Covered with guilt, infection, debt, and want,
My home a brothel, and the streets my haunt.
For seven long years of infamy I've pined,
And fondled, loathed, and preyed upon mankind,
Till the full course of vice and sin gone through,
My shattered fabric failed at twenty-two.”

Marriage, in some form or another, is now the rule, and it is evident that there can be no greater question before mankind. That, and its result, the reproduction of human life, affect the whole duties and relationships of life. In some form or another they lie across the threshold of every path of economic or individual reform. Human prosperity and its opposites—poverty and misery—all have their origin there. The questions arising out of the customs of polygamy and polyandry have no concern for us, as they are in use only amongst uncivilized, semi-barbarous nations, and have no effect on the populations of Europe which we are treating of. Marriage, Christian marriage, is what concerns us. Before it all other questions must give way. It lies at the core of all civilized thought. It touches everybody. Nobody can escape from its consideration at some time of life. It affects all the ramifications of human interests. Marriage and the family are the basis of all civilization. Without them the human race would retrograde to the condition of the brutes which fight with each other to enable them to satisfy their carnal appetites. Yet there are some found amongst us to-day who advocate a state of morality which could only end in a pandemonium like this. Wisely, most wisely, has it been laid upon every man that his only proper moral condition in these respects is to be joined to one woman for life, and that he is to leave all else for her. At the creation of man the Almighty laid down that law for mankind to follow unreservedly; and its divine origin and human utility are amply proved, for wherever it is disregarded men and women fall into savagery and decay. But man has been given the power

of choice. Ought marriage and the generative instinct of mankind to be indulged in and given full expression to, under no matter what circumstances or times, in every degree and form; or ought man himself to place some restrictions on his reproduction? Undoubtedly, in early, ignorant stages of his career, besides the positive checks which then prevailed in the shape of wars and famines, he adopted merciless, brutal ones, such as abortion and infanticide. Even later on, in considerably more civilized times, these were in use. The advanced learning and civilization of Greece and Rome made use of and sanctioned them. Aristotle approved of their adoption, and, moreover, stated that when population became excessive they should be enacted by law. On the other hand, Roman writers condemned the practice, although they state it was very common, and that the patrician women practised abortion to preserve their figures, which we are told is the same object for which Frenchwomen now practise Neo-Malthusianism. The better educated, more far-seeing Roman policy was to induce population, but it was outwitted by the pernicious habits of the time. The Greek policy was to repress it at all hazards. (See Lecky's *European Morals*.) Mommsen shows us how in early times the Roman considered a home, wife, and children to be the very essence of proper life and citizenship; but how in later, more degenerate times, when luxurious habits had developed, all these fell into disrepute, and that the Gracchian laws, the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppæa*, had no effect in curing the disorder. Rossbach also tells us that the earlier Romans always regarded the procreation of children as the true end of marriage. Directly, he says, this was despised, and abortion and infanticide adopted, the empire fell. Notwithstanding their adoption of so-called prudential checks, savage races, given over to reckless and heedless procreation, knowing no self-restraint in sexual matters, increased inordinately; and for that very reason, tribes such as the Scythian and the Hun, issuing forth out of their forest lairs, overthrew a world in arms, because hunger pressed them on. Their means of subsistence was disordered, and they were forced to seek new sources of food. Tacitus gives us a full description of all this exodus. In very early times, however, when population was scanty, and had to make its way in the face of outward repressive influences, men, actuated by self-preservation, by no means restricted the increase of their species.

Alison, in his great work, *The History of Population*, enters very minutely into this aspect of the matter, and shows us how in very primitive times man's only hope of existence and preservation consisted in increasing his numbers, and thus be able to conquer and overcome the wild beasts by which he was surrounded. But when this was accomplished, this impetus to increase was not necessary. Yet population was still recklessly allowed to increase; hence the means of subsistence, owing to lack of agricultural knowledge, became disordered. This heedless procreation has gone on ever since. Man has utterly disregarded all rules and order for his own reproduction, and now we are reaping the fruits of his neglect.

There are now no new worlds to conquer, except by the peaceful paths of immigration, which are not, alas! made sufficiently smooth, yet man recklessly increases his species. Owing to an unwise system of generation, and being unable, through an adverse and unnatural so-called civilization, to obtain sufficient work to maintain himself and children, or outlet to where he could do so, he is necessarily driven to compete within himself to the utmost, most merciless stretch of fury; hence all our present troubles. All rule and order in marriage—that which of all terrestrial matters most affects all human life, especially under such unnatural conditions as we are now living—are completely cast aside as of no importance. From this arises what we are pleased to term the survival of the fittest. Thousands upon thousands of miserable babies are born tired, merely to die almost immediately—poor weakened infants who ought not to have been conceived; some drag out a few years of more or less pain, and then perish; others grow up to struggle in the general scramble, they themselves to be soon overcome and go under. The strongest only survive; and this cruel, inhuman, merciless system is called “weeding-out,” “nature at work,” “the survival of the fittest.” It is considered quite the proper course. All this human wreckage cast upon the earth is only the working of a beneficent nature. It is too absurd. If it was not truly awful in its results, the system might be termed sheer waste. And yet it continues. People have grown up in it, grown accustomed to it, think it quite natural, that man cannot help it, it is part of the order of the world. Yet, if he thought, he would certainly see that abortion and infanticide would be far preferable, from a humane point of view, and save much

human suffering. We are told that all this dreadful system is most excellent and effectual in preserving the best types and crushing out the unfit. If the goal or *summum bonum* of the human race can only be attained by means of a *laissez faire* evolution, or the survival of the fittest from among multitudes of sufferers as age by age rolls on, as Darwin, Spencer, and others teach, we can only reply, that that kind of evolution does not accord with Christianity or the most elementary notions of justice and mercy. It would inevitably lead us to believe that the Creator, by laying down such a cruel law for mankind to be improved by, is a ruthless monster, regardless of all individual suffering. It would cause us to believe that our ordinary feelings of justice and sympathy are not the attributes of God.

Behind all the piteous scramble and melancholy aspect of human struggles now taking place for food and life amongst mankind, we Christians fully believe that there is a design of a loving God, who pities it all, yet still leaves man to work out his own destiny, which course will be far better and more advantageous for man himself than if He was to interfere directly. Tangled and difficult to understand all this suffering has been in the past and present stages of the world's history ; but it must be always remembered that now we see through a glass darkly, but in the end we faithfully believe that all its purpose will be amply explained.

It was the argument of the Deists that if God was proved to do what our sense of justice and mercy could not approve of, or consider to be in accordance with the perfection of any divine character, no evidence could make them believe in Him. Some of us are familiar with Clark's insistence of the divine morality as identical with our moral consciousness. Goldwin Smith calls it the grand doctrine of Clark as to the identity of human and divine justice.

If the survival of the fittest through long ages of struggle is the proper law of nature and nature's God, then we are opposing it by every means in our power, for we are attempting to heal, to bolster up, to prolong lives, which we ought not if that system be the right one ; we ought, on the contrary, to hasten them on to their end as quickly as possible.

We Christians believe that Christ revealed the Creator, His Father, and that His greatest care and consideration is love for mankind. Surely, if God is love, it cannot but be that whatever

hurts man, or is an injustice to him, must be hateful in the eyes of his Creator. Proper evolution, no doubt, has its place in design; but we ought to believe that this, so far as man himself is concerned, is intended to take place through his reason and intelligence, not through blind crassness and opposition to nature's most simple laws. We surely ought to believe that man's evolution, in the true and proper sense of the word, ought to take place through reason, which he alone of all animals has had given him, instead of through the multiplication of the unfit, with only a few of the least diseased surviving. That evolution is the law of laws concerning everything which can apply to man's nature and surroundings there cannot be the slightest doubt.

"There wanted yet the master-work, the end
Of all yet done—a creature who, not prone
And brute as other creatures, but endued
With sturdiness of reason, might erect
His stature, and upright, with front serene,
Govern the rest, self-knowing, and from thence
Magnanimous to correspond with heaven."

Without entering into the question whether man was gradually raised from an arboreal anthropoid ape to a higher grade of being, and then at a certain further stage the spirit of God was infused into him, thus weaning him from the brutalizing effects of the reminiscences of his animal origin, or created at one moment mostly as he is now, nobody can deny that evolution plays, and has played, a most crucial part in man's mental and physical development.

Gradually man has become master of everything; and the time has now come when he can rule his own evolution. Formerly, when he was ignorant and savage, brutality ruled him; but he was led by degrees out of a lower into a higher life, and no doubt the rule of the survival of the fittest acted ruthlessly in the process. But as man becomes more intelligent, more self-restrained, less savage, less ruled by animal passion, this survival of the fittest and massacre of the unfit ought to cease to be. Such a system, with its inevitable consequences, cannot be a part of man's improved, intelligent, more matured nature. Is it to be believed that in these days of superior knowledge everything which bears upon man's reproduction is to be left to the blind passions of his lower nature? It is impossible. Moralists tell us that man's highest life should be

a struggle to overcome all lower passions and desires. Surely we have arrived at the time when man is not to be considered a mere generating animal.

“The pestilence that springs
From unenjoying sensualism has filled
All human life with hydra-headed woes.”

When man looks back on the disordered condition of a lower nature, out of which he no doubt issued, he sees all the chaos there; he sees the struggle for life going on throughout savagedom, in which his species once played so piteous a part, but out of which a divine care and guidance has led him. He surely ought to profit by what he sees and what his species has experienced. Whatever may be the conditions of a lower creation and nature, the survival of the fittest cannot have any due and recognized part in the evolution of civilized man. It must be remembered that the struggle for life between the lower animals cannot for a moment be compared with that between man and man. The lower creation has no mind, no foreknowledge, no idea of what the future may bring. Man possesses the faculties of memory, reflection, and anticipation, which lower animals do not. They eat, they drink, they sleep, they give free licence to every animal desire, they indulge in sexual gratification under all circumstances, at every available time, in every place; and as long as they can have all these *ad libitum* they are supremely happy, with no haunting cares to harass them. Poignant grief is unknown to them; anxiety for the future has no place in their lives. The pig wallowing in his sty is the essence of animal happiness; he has no trouble until the momentary cut of the knife ends his mortal career. Lower animals have no nerves like ours, and far less physical sufferings to undergo than man; to them the past and the future are blanks. How is it possible, then, to compare man's struggle for life with theirs? The former is affected by it both in mind and body, the latter in body only, and that only momentarily.

We Christians must refuse to believe that the strong are to trample on the weak, and that by their doing so man is to be evolved into his Utopia in ages to come. Many, seeing the struggle for life continually proceeding amongst the lower types of creation, think that the same must necessarily be a part of man's nature and environment also, but it certainly

need not be so ; if it is, it is caused by neglect of proper rules of marriage and reckless procreation. Man is capable of adjusting his own reproduction as he pleases. Lower animals have not that power of discernment. There is a fixed gulf between him and them in this most important respect. They can only act in accordance with a blind instinct which impels them on regardless of the future. In all lower animals the generative appetite is irrestrainable. In man it is not so ; he has had reason given him, which Butler described as the "candle of the Lord," to guide him in this as well as in all other matters which come before him. Moreover, experience adds to his reason in this matter of reproduction. He alone has learned to guide and help nature. We know very well that nature, bountiful as she is, is most materially helped on to improvement by man's guidance. If left to herself, she runs riot everywhere. In the case of a garden, nature, unrestrained by man, fills it with useless weeds. We do not suppress nature there, but guide it into more convenient channels for man's benefit. We know the difference between hot-house and out-of-door grapes, and many other such-like things. We know that if a man imbibes poison, and be left to nature alone, he dies ; if nature be helped, he survives. So precisely ought it to be, without anything immoral or destructive to the individual or the nation being done, with regard to man's reproduction of himself. Lower animals are quite incapable of doing this ; but man can, and always so acts in animal and vegetable cultivation. In the selection of all animals which are useful to him he always acts with a view to help nature. What are our prize cattle, our thoroughbred horses, our best produced of all animals, but the result of man's guidance and help to nature ? In dealing with his own stirpiculture, alas ! he acts without the exercise of any reasoning power whatever. Old and young, strong and weak, whole and diseased, mentally powerful and mentally weak, all marry and are given in marriage, utterly regardless of what the issue of such marriages will be. Is it any wonder, then, that the multiplication of the unfit and the survival of the fittest takes place amongst mankind ? It is perfectly clear that all these piteous results are caused by man's own wilful neglect of the reason with which God has endowed him, and not from God's indifference to the welfare of His children. In this matter, as in all others, God will only lead man to better things by allowing him

to exercise the reason which He has given him; when he breaks away from it, he is surely punished in some way. "When a being, whose safety depends on the perfection of a system of laws, abandons the system by which he lives, he becomes subject to that lower grade of laws which govern lower intelligences." (Cope, *Origin of the Fittest*.) In gratifying their sexual appetites, the lower animals, bereft of reason, have no other object but present self-indulgence; they have no idea that the result of their sexual intercourse will be the reproduction of lives similar to their own. At certain times, not of their own choice, they are driven by nature to reproduce themselves, and they cannot resist sexual feelings and instinct. They act upon the spur of the moment; they have no moral power, no power of self-control in the slightest degree, whether in this or any other matter appertaining to the senses.

It is somewhat difficult to imagine a greater mistake than Lady Henry Somerset makes in her article, "The Welcome Child," when, arguing that a wife ought to be left the power to choose when, if at all, she shall become a mother, she says, "Whoever doubts this has only to study the laws of God written in the life of the animal world, and he will find that the whole creation, in a natural state, is founded on the principle of the mother's right to choose when she will become a mother." Greater nonsense was never written. Utterly irrespective of her own choice, the female of all lower animals is acted upon by nature at certain times for the purpose of reproduction, and she associates with the first of her species she happens to meet with. Not the slightest vestige of a choice of time, opportunity, or place is left her. To human nature is allotted by its Creator a totally different state of action with regard to its reproduction. Man is perfectly well aware of what the result of his sexual intercourse will be, hence the enormous difference between man and the lower animals. They have no powers of discernment. It is therefore quite in accordance with our ideas concerning the fitness of things that amongst lower creations of nature we should find a most disordered condition of existence, ending in a survival of the fittest after much suffering had been endured by the weakest. But man, not only in his own case, but also in that of the lower animals, can remove them out of the struggle. He was created to have dominion over them; and so, when he brings them under his control by domestication, he protects them from the bitter-

ness of the struggle for life. The lower animal under man's guidance, both as regards its life and reproduction, is in a very different condition to what it is in its wild and savage state. Its young are carefully fed and tended, no more life is allowed to be produced than what is necessary, and so the survival of the fittest is attained without any cruelty. In its wild state the animal has to seek its food as it best can, in all manner of struggle, and with divers means of torture; but in a domesticated state all these hardships of existence are removed. The lion in the zoological gardens is maintained in a very different way from that in which it would support itself in a wild state.

People say that one of the greatest mysteries of life and difficulties of belief is the existence of pain and suffering, which are the consequences of creation. Look at the wild beasts, they say, carnivorous animals, which cannot exist without causing pain to others. They cannot help themselves; if they do not inflict pain and suffering upon others, they die themselves in pain. What a mystery it all is! Why did their Creator create them so? How is all this to be reconciled with the belief that God is good, and loves all His creatures? But surely, if we think a little more, we can see that this mystery is capable of some explanation. As long as these animals are in a wild state they massacre and devour one another, but when man comes upon the scene the whole situation undergoes a transformation at once. When they come under his dominion, which was intended, all their cruelty to each other ceases at once. In the cases of those which have to live on animal food, they are given it by him at little or no pain to those who have to die to give it. Moreover, as man penetrates further and further, in his mission to subdue the earth, into the haunts and lairs of the carnivora, he destroys them, and only keeps alive those which are useful to him, and those are not many. The useless he extirpates, and thus more and more reduces the suffering.

Everything tells us that man was to be the master of nature, and guide it into channels most productive of good and utility to him. He is the being which was created to bring order out of disorder, regularity out of irregularity, fitness out of chaos, both in the animal and vegetable kingdoms. When men cast away their reasoning powers with regard to their own reproduction, the inverse order of these things must ensue. They bring themselves thereby under the disorder

of an uncontrolled nature—they relapse into an unprotected state; and thus they inevitably bring about in themselves the survival of the fittest. Malthus' advice of prudent marriage holds as good now as it ever did, and will as long as the world lasts, no matter what perfection of distribution or nature of food we may arrive at. Properly-regulated marriage—without undue postponement, without anything immoral, without anything detrimental to either the individual or the nation being done—will afford a very great solution to the difficulties attendant upon an excess of population. As Malthus truly observed, the checks to population may come from either man or nature. They are preventive or repressive—moral restraint; vice, or poverty. We have hitherto adopted, without bounds, the two latter. Surely the time has now come when moral restraint ought to have more power and force than it has hitherto had in checking an excess of population. Chastity for too long a period of time is not demanded, but only for that time which the personal health of the individual rightly requires, and the economic prosperity of the nation justly demands. Increasing power of self-control, which we are now happily acquiring over our lower nature, will in the end be the means of producing that self-restraint which all nations must have recourse to sooner or later in dealing with population. Those who uphold the *laissez faire* system of dealing with population as the best and soundest, ought logically to believe that life is not a good thing, that for the vast majority it is not worth living, and the sooner it is crushed out the better. They believe that nature cannot abide in lower types. Quite so; but those who can command nature might compass those ends better by not permitting nature to have any inferior type upon which to wreak its salutary laws. Marx very forcibly says, with regard to this, that an abstract and unchangeable law of population only exists for plants and animals, and for these only in so much as they are independent of man's influences; in other words, according to Schaffle—"Bau und Leben"—there is a natural as well as a human selection. See also the force of Dr. Reich's writings on the function of reproduction in man being placed under the dominion of his will, and also Mr. Lang in *Problems of the Future*, where he takes a pessimist view of the future, and declares that, if the present excess and multiplication of the unfit does not diminish, he can see no other palliation

of the trouble but a huge increase of the death-rate. In addition to the struggle for life, and the survival of the fittest out of the struggle, which takes place amongst animals and plants in a purely natural state—and the lower we descend in the scale of creation the greater we find it—the great fecundity which takes place amongst them is always accompanied by great mortality. It is precisely the same amongst human beings who recklessly propagate their species. When man was in his savage state he knew nothing of self-control in sexual matters, consequently population increased abundantly. Then nature stepped in, and removed the overplus by a great mortality. We have not yet, notwithstanding increased morality, reached a much better state of things. At the present time a quarter of the population of the world dies before it reaches the age of seventeen. Leslie Stephen and other great thinkers believe that the advantages of this crushing-out, survival of the fittest system, outweigh its disadvantages, and that all is well. But it is contrary to Christian morality, justice, and mercy. It would inevitably lead us to fatalism. Is Hartmann's pessimism to be our only consolation? Are we to weave garlands and sing songs of joyful deliverance over the coffin—one sufferer less in the world, and weep over the cradle—another weary pilgrim entering upon his journey of sorrow and woe? Is man rebelling against this doom of the survival of the fittest, to find the only solution for misery and pain in bringing himself to extinction by refusing to propagate his species? Are the sufferings of this mortal life under this nefarious system only to be ended when man shall deny himself all sexual gratification, and thus cause death itself to die?

Turgot said that everything comes back to life to perish again, and what remains behind bears the impress of what has passed away. If that idea be correct, each generation would profit by the sufferings of those who had gone before, and learn how to avoid them. By this means, it might be supposed that we are to reach forward in time to the attainment of better things; but surely the thought must naturally arise, how much greater the reward should be for those by whose sufferings and miseries the future race of mankind will gain a greater peace. Surely those who have been baptized with the baptism of sorrow, misery, and poverty, in the course of evolution to better things, deserve a greater reward than

those who, through no storms of life, are destined to sail peacefully into the calmer havens of rest which the sufferings of former generations have won for them. Although evolution may be creation's final law, it need not be carried out by reasoning beings, at any rate, by means of a fratricidal struggle the one against the other—the man against the woman, one person longing for the death of another so that he might fill the vacant place, one man to gain a better position or merely his food by trampling on the bodies of his massacred fellow-creatures, whom he has slain in his struggles to succeed, as the Amazonian creeper overwhelms everything else in the forest in its struggles to reach the sun. Even in the earliest times of which we have historical knowledge, reckless marriages, with their inevitable results—the survival of the fittest and great mortality—had occupied the attention of thinkers. Buddha, attempting to remedy them, went too far in the opposite direction, and wished to have no human propagation whatever. He taught that the only cure for all the ills of life was to suppress all sexual desire. He said that the carnal instinct in man to reproduce his species was sharper than the iron hook with which wild animals were trained, it was more ardent than fire, it was like an arrow planted in the heart of man. He was, of course, a pessimist, and considered that all human life was the incarnation of evil, and meant only suffering; that as long as it existed in the world the latter would only be an inexhaustible field of human suffering and misery; and that the only solution of the mystery was to abolish marriage, all sexual connection, and thus bring life itself to an end. It was a thing which had no right to exist; it was contrary to the will of a good god; it was the production of an evil one. Annihilate therefore all human sexual cravings, he said, and aim only, by overcoming all human passions, at being absorbed into final extinction within the eternal rest of Nirvana. In the Dhammika Sutta he says: "A wise man should avoid marriage as if it were a pit of burning coals."

This, of course, is the opposite extreme. The practice in vogue then was to reproduce life everywhere *ad libitum*, regardless of all consequences; the other, do not reproduce it at all. Hartmann and Schopenhauer teach the same doctrine as Buddha did, namely, human suffering and death will continue until the race, by man's own self-denial, will cease to exist.

The teeming populations of Buddhist countries are, however, a quite sufficient answer to the human attainment of Buddha's doctrines, and the hold they have on the nations which he addressed. As a guide to real life his theory has utterly failed, as it was certainly bound to do, inasmuch as it ignored a higher divine law—that man was to increase, and multiply, and replenish the earth. Buddha's teaching is supposed to be in accordance with that theory which has prevailed in all ages and throughout all countries, namely, that Adam and Eve were forbidden to indulge in sexual gratification—that was to be their probation, their trial, imposed upon them by God ; that they disobeyed, hence all the misery and death in the world ; and that these will continue until man voluntarily returns to the condition Adam and Eve were in previous to their fall. Then, and only then, will all man's sufferings cease. The theory does not pronounce upon the fate of the lower animals. We are reminded, as a proof of the truth of this theory, that the woman who tempted the man was punished by the pains of child-birth. The Christian thinks of the verse in 1 Timothy ii. 15, that through the child-bearing, *i.e.*, bearing Christ, she would be the means of redeeming the world and herself. It is curious how long this theory of sexual extinction has existed in the world. “‘Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.’ They said that He had come to destroy the works of woman, and that Salome having asked Him, ‘How long will men continue to die?’ He replied, ‘How long will women continue to bear?’” (Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, iii. 9.)

Many of the ancients taught that to multiply life was merely sowing death. Tatian, believing this, declared that marriage was merely legalized prostitution. “Some said Satan had created woman. They found life bad, and would not multiply it. Why prepare a harvest for death? Why involve in the Fall, by birth, the undeveloped souls who sleep, still virgin of stain, in the bosom of the unknown Father? The pleasures of sense are only snares of the cosmic powers, who wish to associate us, in spite of ourselves, with the accursed work of the generation of creatures. To escape them, and ascend to the highest heavens, the soul must declare that it had not sown for the Prince of this world.” (See *Les Femmes et la Morale Chrétienne*. Renard.)

I have mentioned these theories merely to show how very much the thought of marriage and its results have occupied the minds of thinkers from the earliest times, and how much even then the dismal science was affecting the thoughts of mankind. In fact, there has never been a time when marriage has not formed the absorbing consideration of the human race. Its result—population—came home so forcibly to the minds of all, that nobody could regard it without either hope or fear, according to the point of view from which it was observed. At the present time it is difficult to foresee what the future of marriage and population will be. Old rules and customs are breaking down everywhere, and new ones—seemingly not for the best—are taking their places. Some take a hopeful view with regard to both, and that without anything immoral being done. They think that there will be no greater pressure than there is now, and that that is, even now, very much diminishing, for the birth-rate is falling everywhere throughout all civilized countries. (See, with regard to this, "The Probability of a cessation of the growth of Population in England and Wales during the next century." *Economic Journal*, December, 1895. Car) It is very difficult to predict what will happen in the immediate or distant future with regard to it. We have some grounds, however, for believing that reason will at length prevail, and that population will not increase so marvellously and recklessly as it has done during the present century. We have some grounds for hope that all the extreme pressure and evils resulting from an unrestrained growth of population which we are now experiencing is only temporary, and will cease as soon as wisdom, prudence, and self-control in marriage have permeated the classes which now set these virtues at defiance.

It is reasonably to be expected that as soon as the human race becomes more highly individuated, improved in morals, in thought and requirements, population will decrease. Everybody's attention is being called to the necessity for reforms in the marriage system. Reform in every degree of sexual relationship is in the air, and great good must result from it. The question of marriage, its seriousness, the awful responsibility of increasing life, is now being considered in a manner which it has never been before, and a vast improvement must ensue. Women declare that at length they are permitted to say what they think about it. Formerly their thoughts were

only interpreted by men ; now they can give utterance to their own, and this is no doubt quite right. Until men and women are placed under equal rights in marriage and all its responsibilities, justice will not be granted to women. For instance, can there be anything more outrageous, more unjust, more deliberately insulting to women than that a husband may wallow with loathsome prostitutes, and then disease his wife and children? Yet, horrible be it said, the pure wife and mother is bound by law to submit herself to this monster, whether she likes it or not. He can divorce her for one fault ; she cannot him, unless his many are accompanied with cruelty. It is time that such inequalities between men and women should cease.

How long is such an injustice to be inflicted on pure English wives and mothers? It is in such cases as these that women's voices should certainly be heard. With regard to the freedom, when married, to decide when they shall be mothers I have previously dealt. Duty to a good man and husband must be their guide in this, as well as in all married life.

That men should place some moral limit, in consideration for wife and children, on their own reproduction admits of no doubt whatever. Even in the most ideal state of prosperity and equal distribution there should be some attention paid to this point. Nature itself—God's law—tells us that it should be so. "Be fruitful and multiply" must be acted upon in accordance with man's reasoning powers and dictates of conscience. For instance, girls can conceive and bear children as soon as puberty commences, but will any civilized being—I am not now including, of course, nations of warmer climates, where the age of puberty and full development is reached much earlier than by those of colder regions—advise or permit them to do so? In the former, girls attain that period at a very early age, followed equally by an early old age, no woman being a mother after she has reached the age of twenty-five.

If we permitted our girls to bear children as soon as they had reached the age of puberty, population would enormously increase. But we exercise our reason here ; we guide nature, we hold it in check, where otherwise it would run riot and bring great trouble. For instance, nature tells us, by constant menstruation even in the case of a mere child, that her con-

dition, according to its own harsh rules, is wrong ; for what is menstruation but a revolt of nature? Before that period the womb has been prepared by nature for the reception of the ovum, and menstruation is but an angry revolt against its law of conception not being carried out. Nature in man must be controlled. An immense number of cases occur in which it cannot be left to itself ; if it is, we most certainly suffer in some way. Nature is not a safe guide in all circumstances of life, especially in the matter of conception by young girls. If they married at fifteen, and lived married lives without artificial checks to conception, they would bear, on an average, nine to twelve children, instead of the lower average which our reason brings about.

In every civilized state young gentlemen and young ladies can only be permitted to look at each other through the grille of the preventive check which Colonel Perronet Thompson suggested. Inferior animals only obey their natural sexual instinct in this respect ; but where man rules he restrains his own, for he is well aware, through experience, that the produce of immature beings is not so strong and healthy as that born of matured strength. Imagine any society of a civilized condition allowing its boys and girls, say at fourteen, to become fathers and mothers. Nature, taken alone, tells us that they could perform those functions, but we keep them, and consequently the extension of the race, in check.

From this fact and many others we learn that population should not be recklessly allowed to increase, but that man, by exercising supervision and necessary restraint, should keep it just at that point where it would afford a due and proper stimulus to increase subsistence, that is, to keep the latter always on the stretch. In this respect unassisted nature seems to afford us some clue to the manner in which necessity might be balanced. The ratio of the natality of boys and girls is generally, with regard to the nations of which we have the possibility of such statistics, as 103 to 100. For instance, in England from 1881 to 1891 the average was 1037 boys to 1000 girls, but of these the death-rate was in the proportion of 1123 boys to 1000 girls. This can be easily accounted for by the risks and hardships which boys have to undergo.

There are some very curious facts with regard to sexuality. In the tropics, and in all hot countries, many more girls than

boys are born; hence the saying of the Moslem, "Allah has given us more girls than boys; hence it is certain polygamy is from God." Amongst the Jews there are notably more boys born than girls. Letourneau says that the rate of Jew natality in Russia is 113 boys to 100 girls; in Breslau, 114; in Livonia, 120. In certain professions masculine births far exceed feminine. Bertillon says that more boys are born to the English clergy than to any other in the whole civilized world. I have inquired into this so far as is possible, and I find Bertillon's statement to be amply confirmed. The return of the Registrar-General of the number of births in England and Wales in 1890 was:—

Males	442,070
Females	427,867
Excess of Males, 14,203.						

In 1891:—

Males	465,960
Females	448,497
Excess of Males, 17,163.						

But this excess of male natality is soon transformed:—

AGES OF MALES AND FEMALES IN ENGLAND AND WALES
IN 1891 UNDER ONE YEAR:

Males	374,432
Females	380,101
Excess of Females, 5669.						

UNDER 25 AND OVER 20:

Males	1,247,346
Females	1,399,066
Excess of Females, 151,720.						

Professor Mayo Smith gives the following figures, showing the proportion of boys to girls in the following countries:—

	1865-78.			1892.		
Italy	.	.	104	...	105	8
Austria	.	.	106	...	105	8
France	.	.	103	...	104	6
Switzerland	.	.	99	...	104	5
German Empire	.	.	—	...	105	2
Holland	.	.	102	...	105	5
Belgium	.	.	102	...	104	5
Scotland	.	.	106	...	105	5
Ireland	.	.	106	...	105	5
England and Wales	.	.	104	...	1	

	1865-78.	
Massachusetts	—	1046
Connecticut	—	1072
Rhode Island	—	1049
Hungary	104	—
Bavaria	103	—
Prussia	104	—
Servia	111	—
Roumania	105	—
Russia in Europe	105	—
Greece	94	—
Spain	104	—
Sweden	106	—

From these figures it can be seen that England and Wales have the lowest rate of all, and it is certain that this decrease is becoming greater every year. The origin of sex has not yet been discovered. (See *Evolution of Sex*, and the article "Sex" in the last edition of *The Encyclopædia Britannica*; also Düsing, *Das Geschlechtverhältniss im Königreich Preussen*.)

Mulhall gives the following natality per thousand in these countries :—

	Boys.	GIRLS.
England	511	489
Scotland	514	486
Ireland	515	485
United Kingdom	512	488
France	513	487
Prussia	514	486
Russia	508	492
Austria	516	484
Italy	517	483
Spain	516	484
Portugal	515	485
Holland	513	487
Belgium	514	486
Denmark	513	487
Sweden	512	488
Norway	514	486
Switzerland	512	488
Greece	519	481
Roumania	521	479
Europe	513	487

From these figures it can easily be seen how greatly in error Miss Glyn is when she says, "The female is said largely to exceed the male birth-rate." What ought to be the standard rules of a proper marriage system under which population might, without any injustice or unfairness to anybody, be kept

at an effective strength? Well, in the first place, immoderately youthful marriages should be avoided; temperance should always be exercised by the married in sexual matters; and no diseased couples should marry. As regards the first, people must learn that, whether there happens to be an excess of population or not—although in the former the matter is greatly aggravated—youthful marriage is most prejudicial to all concerned—to society, parents, and children. Especially it should be laid to heart that too youthful marriage is very fatal. Commenting upon youthful marriage in France, which the Neo-Malthusians assert to be most beneficial, and which their system would very greatly promote, the Rev. A. T. Lyttelton gives us the death-rate in France. Men per 1000

AGE.	MARRIED.	UNMARRIED.	WIDOWERS.
18 to 20	50·0	6·9	
20 „ 25	8·9	12·9	49·6
25 „ 30	6·2	10·2	21·8
30 „ 35	6·8	11·5	14·2

Women per 1000 :—

AGE.	MARRIED.	UNMARRIED.	WIDOWS.
15 to 20 .	11·9 ..	7·5 ...	12·3
20 „ 25 .	9·9 ..	8·3 ..	23·6
25 „ 30 .	9·0 ..	9·0 ..	16·9
30 „ 35 .	9·4 ..	9·9 ..	15·0

Unfortunately, we have no means of ascertaining the death-rate of the youthful married in England, but what occurs in France in this respect would no doubt be equally the case in England. The rate of maternal mortality in England per 100,000 is said to be as follows :—

Between 15 and 25	668
„ 25 „ 35	425
„ 35 „ 45	663
„ 45 „ 55	

This proves the danger for women to bear children at too early or too late an age. An additional danger awaits women who bear children after having passed the age of forty-five; the number of their stillborn children amounts to six and seven per cent. Lionel Beale warns us against too youthful marriages. It stands to reason that imperfectly developed parents cannot produce healthy children, and that the strain

upon the parent must be very great. "There can be no doubt that in the human race early death is by no means an infrequent result of the premature exercise of the generating organs." (Carpenter.) All physiologists assert the same. (See the works of Acton, Lippert, and Duchatelet.) The old German proverb says, "Give a boy a wife, a child a bird, and death will soon knock at the door." Aristotle warned young men against too early marriages, asserting that they were fatal to life. "It is very common for those who marry young to die young." (Napheys.) We must teach the young that continence in sexual gratification until mature age is reached is absolutely necessary for everybody's welfare. "Early marriages and frequent child-bearing destroy the health and strength of the woman, and reduce the whole family life to the level of the brute."

At the present time marriage is undertaken by far too many without any order, without consideration, in the vast majority of cases unadvisedly, without understanding, like brute beasts, and yet it lies at the whole root of most of our present evils. Boys and girls in their teens rush headlong into the holy estate of matrimony without exercising the least foresight, and without making the slightest preparation for the future. If they have no consideration for themselves, they should be made to consider the children who will be born to them. If the parents are not fully developed, especially the mother, neither can their children be. Dr. Cyrus Edson, Health Commissioner for New York, commenting upon the folly of too youthful marriages, says that all abnormal tendencies come from the mother's side, and that if she is not fully developed her children will be mere weaklings, both morally and physically; also that children of older parents are wiser and stronger.

Professor Korosi, of Buda Pesth, says that the ratio of the deaths of children born of mothers below the age of twenty is twice as great as that of children born of older parents; and he also states that the vitality and stamina of the children who may happen to survive are very little.

Darwin wrote as follows on this matter: "Children born of mothers during the prime of life are heavier and larger, and therefore probably more vigorous than those born at other periods." The town of Bar le Duc once made an interesting experiment in this matter. For many years an accurate registration was kept of all children born

to parents under twenty-one years of age. The average number born to such a marriage was 3·16, the remaining average was 2·34; but forty-three per cent. of the children born to the former died before they reached the age of twenty. Schöne, writing upon early marriages, says: "There is in them a loss of men, of wealth, in addition to the diseases undergone by those who bear children too young to do so without danger, the misery, the tears, absence of good spirits, which tend so much to make a population contented. These kind of unions also add largely to the class which cries out for help."

Marriage at too early an age, while both parents are still undeveloped, is condemned by every writer on the subject. Burns, Litzman, Hecker, and Mitchell go deeply into the subject, and all unite in utterly condemning it. The latter says that immature mothers are specially liable to produce idiot children. Statistics amply prove this statement to be true, for the vast majority of idiots are first children. "Premature conjunctions produce imperfect offspring, females rather than males, and them feeble in make and short of stature. That this happens in the human race as well as in other animals is visible in the puny inhabitants of countries where early marriages prevail. To the female sex premature wedlock is peculiarly dangerous, since, in consequence of anticipating the demands of nature, too great a strain is placed upon them." Nature always shows us that the young of immature lower animals are smaller and weaker than those born of the matured in their full vigour and prime. A young hen, for instance, always lays smaller eggs than the full-grown one. When age comes on the same rule applies in all animal creation; there comes the growth, the equilibrium, and the decay. No reproduction of life should be permitted during the former or the latter.

"Marriage at eighteen," said a woman of the world who had tried it, "is what no mother would desire for her daughter. The average girl of twenty is but a girl, insufficiently developed; she attaches too little value to life, to the importance of motherhood, to the dignity of her own person, in a word, to woman's rights as a wife and mother, to enter matrimony at that age."

Previous to the twenty-third year a man is incapable of producing healthy children; if he has children, they are most

likely to be weak and deformed. "The children of immature marriages are rarely healthy. They are feeble, sickly, undersized, often with some fault of mind or body. They inherit more readily the defects of their ancestors, and, as a rule, die at earlier years than the progeny of better-timed unions." Joulin, the greatest of French authorities, said that no girl should marry until for a year at least her stature had ceased to increase, and that if the contrary took place the race would degenerate. Women do not reach their full stature until the age of twenty-five. (See Matthews Duncan on this point in *Fertility, Fecundity, and Sterility*.) Everybody who breeds sheep knows that the lamb of a one-year-old ewe generally dies, and the same occurs in the case of heifers. Sussmilch said that the cow which has a calf while still young never reaches her fullest development. No matter where we look in animal life, we always find the fact that the young should not perpetuate their species staring us in the face. The class out of which spring too early marriages must be taught that this world is not intended solely for mere animal gratification. When Malthus was remonstrated with for the pessimistic tendencies of his book, he replied that this world was not intended to be one of enjoyment, but of probation, and that men were called upon to keep their appetites in check, and were warned that the laws of nature would punish them if they did not. The young must be taught the necessary rules of marriage and purity; generally speaking, these are thrown to the winds. Sexual instinct exists, and the young of certain classes never imagine that it should be kept under control. (See Richard Jefferies' description of the morals prevalent in the country villages of England.) The artizan class in general is growing up quite heedless of restraint in marriage. "The morality of men should tend to overcome physical impulses, and every state of civilized society must have recourse to moral restraint." (Cohn.)

Galton condemns Malthus' principle of prudent marriage, because under it the best types would be likely to die out, for those only would follow it whose progeny would be the best; the least beneficial would crowd out the highest natures. But Malthus' advice was to postpone marriage to far too late an age, and only applied it to one class—the poor one. We must endeavour to teach all classes, whether rich or poor, that too early marriages are most injurious, not

only from a pecuniary, but from a moral and reproductive point of view also. The earlier years of this century in England saw terrible effects from too youthful marriages and their results—an enormous number of children, who were brought into the world to act as their parents' slaves and helps.

Those who have made themselves acquainted with the inner history of those times know the awful condition which the factory children were in. Brutal and merciless it was, so much so, that then the world saw, for the first time in history, the suicide of children, carried out by them as a means to free themselves from the misery of despair. The strain of competition caused parental love to be an unknown quantity, and parents forced their children, while yet almost infants, to work for them. Youthful marriages and children were the fashion, unrestrained licence was the rule. It might have been hoped that we had now learned better. Not even in savage countries, amongst the most savage nations, are youthful marriages allowed; there is very considerable control kept over the young with regard to marriage in them. No man can marry until he is a warrior, and until he has sufficient means to marry upon. Yet in England, where it might naturally be supposed we have reached some improvement on savagery, we are in a worse condition with regard to our marriage system than any savages. Even in countries inhabited by the latter, where there are no extremes of poverty or wealth, where the communal system is supreme—as in the islands of the Pacific, where all have unlimited access to the soil, where all live out of it, and where it teems with produce, where nobody wants for food—youthful marriages are not permitted; the bridegroom must be a man, a warrior, not a precocious stripling, as is the case now in the artizan class of modern civilized England. Youthful marriages here, especially in the cities and towns, is a matter which now imperatively needs controlling in some way, unless our evils of over-population are to be magnified. It is a matter which all teachers of the young will have to grasp before long, that is if they wish to do their duty to the present and future generation.

Volumes upon volumes have been written upon the terrible and disastrous issues of these unnatural and untimely boy-and-girl-marriages; but I think everything which has been or

can be written upon them is admirably summarized in *The Contemporary Review*, in the article by Mr. Dendy on this subject. Here is the extract, which condenses all previous writings: "You will find the results (of those improvident marriages) most manifest in the lower-class Board Schools. The troops of ragged, dirty, stunted little urchins, neglected and crippled in mind and body, that you will see there, are the offspring of these reckless marriages. Follow them home, and you will see the ruined lives of their parents; the mothers are either worn-out drudges before they have reached middle-age, or have developed into the careless slatterns who live on the door-steps, gossiping with like-minded neighbours; the fathers, with all self-respect crushed out of them, are reduced to picking up odd jobs at the street corner, and live more in the public-house than in their wretched homes. If we think, further, what the children brought up under such surroundings must become, the question of improvident marriage shows itself as one of the most serious of modern social life."

We are all very well aware that the power of population is not to be found merely in its numbers, but in its stamina and vitality. The birth-rate may be very high, but those who reach manhood and womanhood may be very few; so that it is the quality, not the quantity, of the birth-rate which is the most important point and factor in the matter. There cannot be any profit in a large birth-rate if the children die in the first year. This is the test from which we are in a position to judge of the state of affairs in France. There we have a falling birth-rate, and also a rapidly-falling decrease of men at the best age, namely, between fifteen and sixty; therein lies the future ruin of France. It will not be of such bad import to us, if we have a falling birth-rate, if those children who are born are strong and individuated, capable of reaching to adult vigour, and not mere human wreckage.

"In our present state of society the majority of children do far otherwise than increase the productive power and the success of the labour of the parent; and, on the contrary, it generally happens that the lowest ranks of society are those where there are most characteristic anti-social qualities and apathy." We are told by medical authorities that the whole tendency of modern civilization is to reduce the children of the more refined type, and to increase those of the lower. Rich feeding and luxurious habits are particu-

larly liable to interfere with conception. The fecundity of the human race is diminished by the life prevalent among the rich, and augmented by the habits and spare diet of the poor in the proportion of over six to one.

If this reckless procreation by the class least fitted for it, with its consequent high death-rate, which is the present pernicious custom, continues, our higher birth-rate will not benefit us in the least—nobody but the insurance offices and the undertakers. The classes among which these improvident marriages take place are really deserving of our pity. They offend through ignorance; they have had nobody to warn them against their own folly. Nobody tells them how fatal to life youthful marriage is likely to be to the man, how detrimental to the girl, and how shockingly inhuman to the child. They have been left to writhe in their ignorance of such matters; no man cared for their welfare, hence the results we see to-day. If the girls of these classes had been taught by their more delicately nurtured and refined sisters that a girl's life is not intended to be a mere scene of animal gratification, if they had been spoken to on these matters of purity when they were at an impressionable age, the lamentable evils which we all so bitterly deplore would not have been called into being. When girls have had this most necessary teaching they soon learn to cast off animal desires, marry later in life, and do well for themselves and all concerned. The daughters of the well-to-do are better taught in these matters, and carefully guarded. It is the poor, uncultivated, ignorant, sensual hoiden of the streets who recklessly increases population and laughs at the future. She never thinks for a moment of the obligations which rest upon her of making provision for a home and children; yet, if she looked at lower nature, she would see that her sex even there always makes provision for them. More often than not all the capital which the modern girl-bride has is the week's wages of the boy-bridegroom, and those, generally speaking, are consumed in drink on the wedding-day. Nothing has been saved, nothing laid by for illness or want of work; hence much of our present miseries and distress; hence arises over-population, and that mostly helpless and diseased.

Mr. Dendy writes of these marriages: "All the morning there has been a noisy crowd round the church gates, and a

row of the shabbiest vehicles and most broken-down horses in London has stood waiting to carry off the wedding parties to the railway station or to the nearest public-house. In this way they will spend the day, sampling the public-houses, and making merry among their friends, until any lingering traces of the sobering effects of the morning ceremony have been well washed away. One wonders, watching them, at the light-hearted way in which they take this step. For the girls especially it means burdens—which seem almost too heavy to be borne—of care and sickness and poverty, of hopeless squalor or unceasing toil, leading to premature old age or death. By the time they are twenty-five all the elasticity and vigour of youth are crushed out of them, and those who maintain their self-respect have nothing to look forward to but drudgery. These early marriages are the curse of the poor. Couples such as these will not even wait to get a decent home together. An old bedstead and bedding, two rickety chairs and a table to match, a strip of greasy carpet, and two or three cracked cups and saucers, these will be collected from sympathizing neighbours, or picked up for a few halfpence from the costermonger's stall. There are thousands of such homes, which have not cost ten shillings to put together."

The following anecdote reveals something of the manner in which the holy estate of matrimony is entered upon at the present day. A wedding of a youthful couple took place recently somewhere in Haggerston, at which the bridegroom offered a handsome pipe to the officiating clergyman by way of payment of the fee. Times were bad, he said; he had no money, all he could do was to give the pipe as the fee; the manufacture of pipes was his trade, so he could do that much. The offer was well meant, but what of the home-life set up upon such an insecure foundation? "The boy-and-girl marriages of our great cities form a scandal of the worst and most loathly type. It is high time that the marriage laws were revised."

The results of these improvident marriages are homes for waifs and strays, workhouse children affected with ophthalmia, hospitals for poor, wretched, miserable children—tiny helpless sufferers doomed to life-long misery, orphan asylums *ad libitum*, baby farms, infanticide, child ill-treatment and massacre, temptation to hardened women to murder cast-off infants, multitudes of children in workhouses, to be supported by those who,

knowing the responsibilities of life, refrain from giving it. The youthful and unfit marry; hence there arises a mass of humanity in which the survival of the fittest acts with merciless severity. Of course, by such means nature preserves the balance; but oh, the pity of it, to cause nature so to act! Surely here prevention is better than cure. Intense is the misery all round when there has been no provision made for illness or death by the bread-winner; the wife or widow and children are hawked about pleading to the generosity and charity of others.

If the wisest course, as some say, to adopt is the public maintenance of children by the State, there would then be strict rules enacted with regard to human generation; under the present system we have all the evils and none of its advantages. For instance, it is outrageous that young villains should be allowed to seduce girls wholesale, leave them and their babies to be cast into the workhouse for honest people to support, while they march off into unknown lands scot-free, having satisfied their sexual appetites as they pleased, and leave to others to pay for their results. It is simply incredible and unbearable that, under our present state of civilization, the men who do such things should not be severely punished by being brought under the laws which govern felony. We see certain crimes of vice, which do no harm to anybody except to those primarily engaged, punished in the most vigorous, exemplary manner by exceedingly long sentences of penal servitude; but seductions of girls, most harmful to all, are treated as of no importance. What inconsistency there is in the English nation and in English legislation? It seems incredible that those who do such wrongs to girls and children, leaving them to the charge of society, should not be more severely punished than those who adopt the habits and customs which prevailed in the cities of Sodom, Gomorrah, and the plain. What a scene for wonder and amazement the streets of our cities and towns present at the present time when the hour for closing school arrives. What multitudes of mostly helpless and uncared-for children visible everywhere, and every year additional school-buildings become necessary—more and more children. What is to become of them all? Yet still they pour in upon the world in countless hordes. Their origin is reckless and improvident marriages.

How far some of our contemporary types of humanity can

be considered fit to reproduce and protect human life the following extract from *The Child's Guardian* can show. These are "some of the smaller cases" which the S.P.C.C. have dealt with. "Punishing a child by putting pins into its nostrils; putting lighted matches up them; biting a child's wrist till a wound was made, and then burning the wound with lighted matches; burning the hands of a boy of six with matches; biting, till they bled, the limbs of a seven-months-old baby; forcing bone ring of feeding-bottle up and down the throat of a three-months-old baby till it bled; throwing a little girl of two years, ill with bronchitis, out of her bedroom window, breaking her bones and ending her life; breaking a two-year-old baby's limbs in three places, both arms and a thigh, leaving them untended, when it moaned in its pain irritably taking it up from its cradle by the broken arms, shaking it by them, and throwing it down again; leaving a baby unlifted out of a cradle for weeks, till toadstools grew around the child out of the rottenness; leaving another to lie for days and nights on a mattress alive with maggots; keeping the stumps of little amputated legs sore, to have the child with its little face puckered up in pain to excite pity; tying a rope around a boy of six, dipping him into a canal, leaving him immersed till exhausted, bringing him up, recovering him, and putting him in again, repeating the misery time after time; shutting up for hours in a dark closet a two-year-old child, and so ending its life; keeping a child always in dark cellars till its flesh became green; knocking down with a fist a dying boy; knocking out the first teeth of a baby with a fist; scourging a child till it was a mass of bruises, then breaking its jaw; tying cords tightly round little thumbs, then tying them with extended arms to the foot of a bedstead, then beating it with a thorn bush." Not only are large numbers of people unfit to procreate children, but also to treat them properly.

The young of both sexes in England must be taught that self-control of sexual instinct, with its moral consequences, the production and care of human life, is absolutely essential to their own physical and moral advantage, as well as to that of the community at large. They must gradually learn to clothe themselves with the virtues of prudence and continence, which are higher phases of life than self-indulgence and excess. *Scientific Meliorism* says that it is quite useless to appeal to

the finer feelings of the masses with regard to sexual restraint, and that we can only do so with effect when we appeal to their lower and more selfish ones, and that Neo-Malthusianism is the only thing they will listen to. "Unless the method we adopt is fitting to their purely selfish or egoistic state of feeling, we must fail. There is no force that we can rationally expect to influence them but one, namely, their own personal interests." This, of course, is a confession that Neo-Malthusianism cannot form the ground of an appeal by morality. It also means that the masses are incapable of being touched by righteousness and moral truths, which I deny, and it also implies that we may do evil to cause good.

Many believe, and continually remind us, that moral restraint in sexual matters has never been practised, and never will be, and that economic restraints are the only ones which have had, or will ever have, any effect upon the birth-rate. This is, of course, admitting that moral improvement in such matters is impossible, which is certainly not the case. When men become educated, refined, less of the animal, then moral power becomes supreme, and guides all the actions of life and duty. Education in these matters of sex is beginning to tell a tale at last. Since the year 1874 the marriage-rate of those under age has declined in England—from 8·4 per cent. of men and 22·7 of women to 5·9 and 19 respectively. People are beginning to learn that self-control is the first condition of all morality. To command, and not to be a slave of the passions, is man's proper state. When this most desirable condition is reached, we can have some hope that the present disordered excess of population will lessen in intensity. "The primitive savage could have no limit or restraint in his sexual relations; but as men became civilized, the moral feelings were developed and the sentiment of responsibility widened, the physical factor also came to be restrictive of the birth-rate." (Nitti.)

The moral man exercises moral, prudential self-control in these matters; the ignorant and brutal economic only. But surely the time must come when education and refinement will influence larger numbers than they do now, and thus much trouble will cease. The more these act upon the multitude, the more higher views on marriage, with its attendant stupendous responsibilities, will become the rule and not the exception. If the church would only do her

duty in these matters, and teach young men and women what they ought to know in these sexual matters, how very different things would be! Mr. Dendy says on this point: "Nor are those who should be the teachers of the young on such important matters wholly without blame; their doctrine--that to discourage early marriage is to encourage immorality--is a gross injustice to the majority of the poor, perhaps, if they did but know it, the greatest of which they have, as a class, to complain of at the present day. Evil enough there is, as all know who have much to do with the poor; but those amongst whom these marriages take place are just those who still have a respect for such obligations as they have been taught to recognize, and they are far more likely to sink to a lower level in consequence of their imprudence than they would be in consequence of judicious teaching and warning. As it is, they are acting up to the highest standard which has been set before them, and we have no right to assume that if they are shown one still higher they will not aim at that also. To realize that the people have a capacity for rising as well as falling is the next step towards the social Utopia, in which no one will enter upon the responsibilities of marriage without a fair prospect of being able to bring up a family in decency and comfort." Everybody admits the terrible evils consequent upon these youthful marriages, and yet nothing is done to save these poor children from themselves. The evil must still be reduced. Those who know the internal life of our large cities are well aware of the manifold troubles arising from these immature marriages--the feebleness, the diminutive stature, the wizened look of the generation now growing up. We surely cannot be wrong when we attribute the existence of many of the unemployed to reckless youthful marriage. The nation must be taught that if it is to prosper, to produce healthy children, it must control sexual desire, it must hold animal passions in check; it must learn to give expression to them only within lawful limits, at proper age, in God's appointed manner, and that such action is the highest phase of religion and morality; that the union of the man with the woman should be undertaken "reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, in the fear of God." No class has more responsibility, in this most necessary course of action, thrown upon it than the clergy, yet the subject is far too much neglected by them.

In a speech the other day in London, Sir Walter Besant—and who is more competent to give an opinion on these matters?—said: “I urge the need of the clergy speaking to the young on self-respect. We have bitterly to mourn over the terrible things which happen through boy-and-girl marriages.” The clergy are, as a rule, far too much reserved and reticent in speaking to the classes which most need advice on these matters of sex. What they treat with the utmost levity and familiarity, and converse together upon at every available opportunity (see Richard Jefferies’ works), the clergy are far too shy to speak out openly upon. Moreover, on these very matters far too many of the clergy set a very pernicious example themselves. Here are some examples of reckless marriages undertaken and entered into by some of the clergy, taken from a report of the Friends of the Clergy Corporation:

(1) A vicar with eight children under seventeen years of age, with a gross annual income of £140, now much reduced owing to agricultural depression.

(2) A vicar with seven children under seventeen, with an annual income of £145.

(3) A curate with seven children under eighteen, and a yearly stipend of £130.

(4) A rector with six children under eighteen, and £105 annual income.

(5) A vicar with seven children under seventeen, and £89 annual income.

(6) A chaplain with five children under eleven, and an annual income of £100.

(7) A curate with six children under thirteen, and a stipend of £115.

People naturally look to those who preach to practise, and it must be confessed that there is much room for improvement amongst the ranks of the clergy in these matters. The Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, said some time ago: “The cases of distress which come before the Poor Clergy Societies would form a melancholy page in the history of human suffering.” The other extreme, of unduly late or no marriage at all, is equally destructive to social morality. “The desirable system is marriage at a reasonable age.” (Mayo Smith.) We must not attempt or endeavour to promote an unjust, unworkable, and unduly prolonged marriage system. To enforce such a scheme would be an

injustice, an absurdity, and an impossibility. Undue restraint to marriage, which would have a tendency to postpone it too long, would inevitably destroy social morality, and produce widespread illegitimacy on a gigantic scale, as well as all kinds of vice, as indeed the present enforced system of too late marriage does now. The great question of marriage, or abstention therefrom, must, in rightly-ordered communities, always be left to conscience, and to properly-guided individual and public opinion. Bavaria once experimented upon legal suppression of marriage, with the result that illegitimacy reached enormous dimensions. In striving to avoid Scylla we must not fall into Charybdis. We must take care, when we rightly deprecate the foolish custom of too youthful marriage, not to fall into the opposite extreme of advocating unduly deferred marriage. Such a scheme would be just as pernicious as too early a one would be. This was the weak point of Malthus' pessimistic arguments. At the present time marriage amongst the better well-to-do classes is postponed far too long. This happens because marriage without large means is considered far too great a luxury. The holy estate of matrimony is made far too much a question of money only. The dowerless girl, good and beautiful as she may be, is cast aside by the man because she has no money, and this is equally the case of the man by the girl. This is an untoward state of things. I have commented upon it before, and I need say no more about it here. In a proper state of society and distribution such reproaches and injustice would not exist. Their consequences are deplorable—for the gentler sex, that unnatural product the unwilling spinster; for the uncontrolled man, vice. It is said that the marriage-rate rises or falls according to general prosperity. Formerly it seemed to depend altogether on the local price of wheat. Now, in consequence of the annihilation of distance, this order is changed, and now it seems to depend on the rate of exports. When these decline, it invariably follows suit, and *vice versa*. This is hardly the best moral standard by which to estimate the holy estate of matrimony. In discussing this question of youthful marriage, it must be remembered that it is the age of the woman which influences the results most, and which ought to be taken into the greatest consideration. Under present conditions, and indeed under all, it would be better for her own welfare and her children that she should not

marry until she had reached the age of twenty-five. She would then have a less number of child-bearing years before her than if she had married at the foolish age of twenty, which the generality of working-girls do now. If marriage at twenty-five was the rule, the possible number of children born to a woman would be about seven or eight, instead of twelve or fourteen, which latter is far too much the case at present. It is to the growing intelligence of women that we must look as a means to bring about a reform in this matter of proper restraint in marriage and population. "The whole population question is less a man's than a woman's question. I cannot doubt that the main avenue of hope that the destitution and misery may be checked at their source is in the growing intelligence and divine discontent of working-women." (Arnold White.) We are told by Ogle that if the marriage age now prevalent amongst women was only postponed five years, the average number of children born to a marriage, which is now 4.2, would fall to 3.1. Matthews Duncan gives the following table :—

AGE OF MOTHER AT HER MARRIAGE.					AVERAGE FERTILITY.
15-19	9'12
20-24	7'92
25-29	6'30
30-34	4'60

The proper age for men to marry at is thirty. The law of Sparta was thirty; Rome, twenty-five. Hesiod said thirty; Plato the same; Aristotle, thirty-seven. It must be readily admitted that causes at present exist in England and elsewhere for promoting youthful marriages. These in a properly-ordered state of society, and with a juster distribution of wealth, would not exist. Early marriages and large families are now sought for as means whereby the parents may be kept out of the workhouse in the future. The children are expected to do this for their parents, and, of course, the more there are of the former the better is the chance of the latter. But if there was a better distribution, this goad to over-population would be removed. If there was a good and workable system of old-age pensions inaugurated, and if some such help and additions were made to pre-marriage savings as Mr. Burdett suggested in his articles in *The Times*, this trouble would be much alleviated.

It is also said, as an excuse for early marriages, that the artizan class is as well off at twenty-one as it is ever likely to be. But it can be replied with, I think, considerable force, that if young men would exercise some slight control over themselves, and utilize the years between twenty-one and thirty to save money, and thus have sufficient capital to start a home with, it would be considerably better for themselves and the community at large. They should learn that by exercising this self-control they would benefit themselves morally, physically, and pecuniarily. Such a course of action on their part would be beneficial all round. "If it be said the poorest class of labourers have no superfluous wealth from which to make provision, Political Economy answers, with undeniable force, that they can at any rate defer the responsibility of marriage and increasing the population until they have secured the minimum required for security against the pecuniary demands of ordinary misfortune." (Sidgwick)

There is another cause for early marriage put forward, namely, that in consequence of the confined space in the houses of artizans, young men are driven into the streets out of their homes at a very early age, and therefore naturally betake themselves to marriage as a means of providing a home for themselves. I quite admit the force of this plea; but if the laws for the better housing of that class were carried out, which they are not, much of the force of this argument would be reduced. I hope to put forward later a scheme which would also very much tend to reduce this difficulty. Another argument raised for the utility of early marriage is, that by them vice is much reduced. But it surely does not of necessity follow that the submission to a reasonable patience and continence should be productive of vice. The professional class, in very many instances, postpones marriage until the age of thirty is reached, and this class is not given over to vice; consequently it ought not to be beyond the power of the artizan class to follow the same dictates of morality. Yet I know many a young man of the latter class has said, "If I keep single I know I shall sin; I will marry, and if I have many children I am sure God will not forsake me, for I took Him simply at His word." It is a sublime faith. In this argument he follows Luther, who said, "God makes children, and He will provide for them." Nitti terms this "an optimistic fatalism." In all the actions of life, especially in

sexual matters, we must act in accordance with the reason which God has given us to use in the decision of such matters, in accordance with the dictates of conscience, and that cardinal virtue prudence. We have certainly not the slightest wish to separate the divine will from the instrumentality of men; but the latter are not justified in acting imprudently, and then think, or expect, that God will interfere and work a miracle in their behalf. They may rest assured that He will never leave or forsake them if they look to Him for help, but they must remember that man's prudence has a rightful place in God's economy. If the unjust causes of poverty were removed by the healthful action of men, and the world was more in the condition which God intended it to be, while at the same time men exercised their prudence and reason, we would have sufficient grounds for believing that the children who are given life would not be in the condition far too many are compelled to be in now. It is all very well for people to write as the following extract shows they do: "They say, 'God sends the little babies.' Of all the dastardly revolting lies men tell to suit themselves, I hate that most. I suppose my father said so when he knew he was dying of consumption, and my mother when she knew she had nothing to support me on, and they created me to feed like a dog from stranger hands. Men do not say that God sends the books, or the newspaper articles, or the machines they make, and then sigh and shrug their shoulders, and say they can't help it. Why do they say so about other things? Liars! God sends the little babies! When people are married, though they should have sixty children, they throw the whole onus on God. When they are not, we hear nothing about God's having sent them. When there has been no legal contract between the parents, who sends the little children then? The devil, perhaps! Odd that some men should come from hell and some from heaven, and yet all look so much alike when they get here!" (Olive Schreiner.)

Elsewhere we read: "A man's children are not really sent any more than the pictures on the wall are sent, or the horses in the stable are sent; and to bring people into the world when we cannot afford to keep them decently is by no means an accomplishment of the divine will, or a fulfilment of nature's simplest laws, but is contrary to reason and the will of God." (*Culture and Anarchy.*)

The action of the spendthrift who so treats human life cannot be defended for a moment, and is entirely contrary to the moral action which God rightly demands from man. The man is guilty ; the laws of God are not at fault or to be blamed. The act of conceiving a child is putting a law of God into action. God acts through the co-operation of the human will, but does not force it. Man can set God's law in motion whenever he pleases, but at the same time God has given man the power to decide whether or not it would be for his own or the child's benefit that he should do so. The moral aspect, the duty to God in the act of procreation, has to be taught to all much more than it is. Again, very much is made by infidel writers of the fact that no consultative voice is given to the child whether it would wish to be born or not. No, the responsibility of bringing life into the world is given to men and women who possess the powers of reason and choice. No doubt whatever but that those who have lost that power, such as the insane and idiots, should be prevented from doing so. Those who have no power of free will should not be allowed to put a law of God into action.

In summing up the whole matter, as Christians, we must believe that whatever men's imprudent sexual actions may be, we are in the world not by mere accident, but in fulfilment of a law of nature ordained by God, and we express that thought in our prayer, "We bless thee for our creation." The propriety or not of putting that law of God and nature into action is left to man to decide. All things may be lawful, but all things may not be expedient. Marriage, population, and all matters relating to sexual instinct require to be treated in a much more scientific and comprehensive manner than they are at present. No greater questions concerning our present and future exist than these, yet they are only spoken of with bated breath by those most vitally concerned. Absolute ignorance prevails throughout the whole class of the young of both sexes, *i.e.* among those who would profit most by proper and judicious counsel being given them.

The law of God will hold good for ever, "The sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children." Knowing this, is it not incumbent on every Christian to do his utmost in advising the young about their marriages? to tell them that to reproduce their lives is "not to be enterprised, nor taken in hand unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men's carnal lusts

and appetites like brute beasts that have no understanding, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God"? It is sad to see what numbers are launched into life wholly ignorant of all the simplest laws of nature and an elementary knowledge of physiology. This is where that golden axiom can act with wonderful good, "Prevention is better than cure." If he had been advised in the days of his boyhood, Burns would not have written as he did—

"If I have wandered in those paths
Of life I ought to shun;
As something loudly in my heart
Remonstrates I have done;

"Thou know'st that thou hast formed me
With passions wild and strong;
And list'ning to their witching voice
Has often led me wrong."

A very distinguished writer says: "In total ignorance, and unassisted by advice or counsel, our boys and girls are left to contend with the fiercest passions that can assail human nature." Rabbi Schindler writes, in *Innocence at the Price of Ignorance*, on the great mistake which is committed by far too many in allowing the young of both sexes to go ignorantly into the world, no information having been given them on such important matters. Mantegazza writes: "Let there be a wiser and more liberal education, to teach girls what they do not know, or know indifferently, so that they can freely say their 'yes' before the altar with perfect knowledge and understanding, that 'yes' which may make a paradise on earth, or a hell of every twenty-four hours for every day in the three hundred and sixty-five." Surely it is better for the young to be taught all they should know in these matters by responsible persons, than that they should learn it from the vicious and depraved in the streets. A vast deal of information on matrimonial matters and the proper rules of antenuptial chastity must be imparted to all classes ere a reform can be brought about. All that the young learn now of these matters is in a most haphazard fashion, more by accident and behind the scenes than anywhere else. They surely ought to be taught that sexual gratification and excess should not be treated of with levity, and that marriage, with all its responsibilities of reproducing life, should not be undertaken

lightly, wantonly, or unadvisedly, to satisfy man's carnal appetite.

Boys and girls are sent to school with very little knowledge of self-control in sexual matters, merely to become the prey of those who happen to be vicious there. Both run the greatest risk of learning the depraved habits of self-abuse and nymphomania. How much better it would have been for them if they had been warned ere they left their homes. The Dean of Canterbury wrote in *Eric*: "The innocence of mere ignorance is a poor thing; it cannot, under any circumstances, be permanent, nor is it at all valuable as a foundation of character. The true preparation for life, the true basis of a manly character, is not to have been ignorant of evil, but to have known it and avoided it; not to have been sheltered from temptation, but to have passed through it and overcome it by God's help."

In the histories of many sad cases of lunacy we learn that solitary indulgence, learned while mere children, has been the primary cause of the malady. The fact is, that everybody who has the care of the young should realize the enormous utility of teaching them something of human physiology. Instead of keeping in the background, as unnatural, all teaching upon what, after all, are God's laws, it should be given at due times and to proper recipients. Sex knowledge will come to all sooner or later; better it should come from those qualified to give it morally than immorally. (See an admirable letter by a Preparatory Schoolmaster on these subjects in *The Guardian*, January 13th, 1897.) It is a false Christianity, mere prudery, which conceals from the young—those who are most deeply interested in being acquainted with it—a sufficient knowledge of how their species is reproduced. Mrs. Barnett says: "In this question early training goes for much, and until the teaching of physiology breaks down the policy of silence, improvement in our schools is almost impossible." Of course, it may be said that a knowledge of physiology may be made use of for a bad as well as good purpose, and Dr. Billing says it has been so used in America. Dr. Strahan also alludes to this, and says that such a bad result as that is not the fault of education in such matters. "Knowledge *per se* does not prompt to immorality or crime; it is only the criminally-minded who will put it to such uses. What we want is not less education, but a purer moral feeling, a higher moral standard among the community generally."

No more important words on this matter of sex instruction to the young were ever written than by Canon Butler, once Headmaster of Harrow: "The question of impurity is closely connected with the sacred cause of education. In dealing with it you cannot begin too early; you cannot safely begin even with boyhood, you must begin with childhood. Experience has convinced me that no boy ought ever to go to school without learning from his father or mother, or from some brother or friend older than himself, the simple facts as to the laws of birth, and the terrible danger of ever coming to talk of these phenomena as matters of frivolous and filthy conversation. We all know that the subject of the relation of the sexes must come before boys sooner or later. From whom should they first learn this knowledge? Should it be with every accompaniment of coarseness, or levity, or obscenity? from the conversation of some wicked servant who has stolen into the stables, the household, or the nursery? from some brother, only a year or two older, who has just received his initiation into impurity at a private school, and is too young to understand its dangers? worst of all, from the idlest, most corrupt, and worthless set of boys at this same private school, who surround the new-comer within a few days of his first joining, and, with knowing looks and enticing words, try to probe his childish knowledge, and leave him half ashamed of himself, and keenly inquisitive for full initiation, if he finds that he knows nothing of this engrossing mystery. Is it right, is it fair, is it consistent with either religious duty or with common-sense, that a little boy of eight or ten or twelve should be sent, at this impressionable age, to hear for the first time of facts about human nature which must ere long be known, and are part of God's appointment? Does not every dictate of humanity and reason point to the conclusion that the dawn of this knowledge, this necessary, exciting, and even fascinating knowledge, should be invested with all that is tender, loving, pure, and sacred, instead of being shrouded in the mists of innuendo, or blazoned forth in the shamelessness of indecency? There is really no answer but one to such a question; and the plain truth is, that fathers, still better mothers, must recognize the duty which lies upon them to teach their children at such times, in such words, and with such reservations as the character of the child may suggest, the elements of that knowledge at least

which will otherwise be learned, but a very little later on, from a widely different set of instructors."

These are words from a man who knew what he was writing about, and should be acted upon in every family. If they were, the moral condition, indeed also the physical one, of England would be very different from what it is at present. We know very well that the children of the well-to-do classes are better cared for with regard to morals, and better protected from vicious companions, than the children of the poor are; yet we are equally well aware that purity and morality have very great struggles to maintain themselves amongst them. We know what the condition of certain schools is. This being so, we can easily imagine what the moral condition of the poor is, seeing everything, hearing everything, as they have to do from their earliest years, through adverse circumstances, surrounded and accompanied with all that is low, coarse, and sensual. (See what Richard Jeffries wrote on this point.) How can they be blamed if they fall into sex troubles? The blame should be on those who, by their sinful neglect, by their refusal to surrender an atom of their luxuries, have left the poor to wallow in the mire of their lower senses.

It must be the rule for all, rich and poor, to teach their children, in a proper manner, the obligations and the duties of sex. When this is done we shall see a vast improvement in proper marriage, and, consequently, a regulated population. It is incumbent upon parent and teacher to point out to the young of both sexes the snares and temptations which will inevitably come upon them in later life in this respect. To warn them against the moral and physical consequences of giving way to sexual temptations is a most solemn duty cast upon all who have charge of the young. If left to themselves, they are apt in some cases to indulge in the wildest ideas and extraordinary mental delusions concerning sexual matters. Such can be read of in *Des Aberrations du Sens Générique*. (Moreau), *Le Roman du Mariage* (Krafft-Ewing), *Psychopathia Sexualis* (Westphal), and in the works of Charcot, Magnan, and Max Nordau. "The thoughts continually revert to the sexual organs and things pertaining to them, lascivious images and morbid imaginations constantly haunt the mind." It is owing to want of instruction in these matters that such multitudes of quacks nefariously reap the golden harvest they do. It is dreadful to think of the

numbers of both sexes who have suffered in mind and body the ravages of remorse and disease, until death ended their sufferings, in consequence of having been launched into the world totally ignorant of all matters concerning sex and purity, totally unprepared to meet all the pitfalls and temptations which they were bound to do. Many a poor soul has fallen unwittingly, not through sin, but through ignorance, into misery and death. Nowhere in the world, amongst no civilized nations, do temptations in these sexual respects exist more rampantly than in England. They are a disgrace and an infamy to any nation. Hence it is no wonder that the young are contaminated and the race diseased. Colonel Howard Vincent said, in his evidence before the Lords' Committee on the Protection of Young Girls: "The evil of juvenile prostitution is not confined to girls; it is applicable to a very large extent indeed to boys. I mean that everything centering in London, as it does in this country, all examinations are held in London, everybody sends their sons to London; and a boy must be a paragon of virtue who, at the age of sixteen or seventeen, can walk, from eleven o'clock at night till half-past twelve in the morning, from the top of Grosvenor Place to the Haymarket without being solicited to such an enormous extent that he is almost certain to fall. I do not know whether your Lordships have ever considered the enormous amount of disease which exists among these wretched girls. I was in the army, and had opportunities of knowing that this state of things does exist to a frightful extent with regard to boys and girls of sixteen and seventeen. There is scarcely a senior boy at Eton, a cadet at Sandhurst, or a subaltern in the army, who will not agree with me as to the enormous danger there is." This being the state of things which exists in London and in all large cities, does it not seem criminal that the young should be sent out into the world absolutely ignorant of what they should properly be instructed in with regard to sexual matters? "Unsuspecting innocence is the prey of systematic vice." The army returns disclose a terrible state as existing now. It cannot but be thought that if English lads had been instructed in sex matters ere they enlisted we would not be obliged to read the following dreadful statistics of the British army. The ratio of admissions for venereal disease per 1000 of strength in England and her possessions into hospital is:—

England	194'6
Gibraltar	306'5
Malta	157'5
Cyprus	185'3
Canada	97'1
Bermuda	43'9
Barbadoes	402'1
Jamaica	190'0
South Africa	255'7
Mauritius	159'7
Ceylon	205'2
China	380'5
Straits	356'4
India	522'3
Egypt	408'3

(*United Service Magazine*. Brigade-Surgeon Climber).

Yet in foreign armies the rate is very low :—

United States	77'45
German	27'3
French	43'8
Austrian	63'6
Italian	71'3
Russian	43'0
Japanese	33'6

See also the article, "The Soldier and his Masters," *Contemporary Review*, January, 1897.

Every lad of sixteen should be given a copy of *The Preservation of Health* (Dr. Dukes), as well as another of *Gerald and his Friend the Doctor*, by the Rev. H. Solly. With both of these he will be forewarned and protected for life. Dr. Dukes writes: "I am fully persuaded in my own mind, from a very large experience, that if immorality is to be lessened in this country, it can only be by a proper knowledge on such matters being furnished to the young of all classes."

Another reform which would be very productive of an improved condition of morals and marriage would be the reduction of temptation. We are continually reminded, indeed vehemently urged, by temperance reformers to reduce the temptations to drink by lessening the number of public-houses; that it is not just and fair to alcoholically-inclined people to be continually brought face to face with temptation at every turn, that it is too great a temptation for them to resist. Yet what can be more disastrous than the *laissez faire* system in which the morals of our streets are left to struggle? Immoral women, unrestricted in number and unrestrained in behaviour, are permitted to solicit young men and boys as

they please. Places of amusement and the streets teem with them; everywhere, and on every occasion, they are allowed to disease our youth *ad libitum*. It is a disgrace to Christianity and to civilization. We despise the Moslem, but the streets of his cities are a pattern for Christianity; not a drunken man nor a fallen woman is ever seen in them.

Mistaken philanthropists think that these evils can be cured by suppressing places of amusement, but their course of proceeding is absurd. People must, and should, have opportunities of amusement, and any attempt to suppress them will always be resisted to the uttermost; but to separate the evil from the harmless is the point to be aimed at, and the Continental authorities understand this principle much better than we do. Those women who wish to be vicious can be so on the Continent, but they may not put themselves into the paths of the pure. What a temptation to the innocent girl, working honestly for her living, is the well-dressed harlot flaunting her ill-gotten gains in her face!

Dr. Parkes, commenting, in his book on Hygiene, on the lamentable state of English law which permits women of this class to appear openly in the streets, says: "The effect of this upon the virtuous female population is very serious. Every servant in London sees the fine clothes, and hears of the idle and luxurious lives of the women of the town, and knows that occasionally a respectable marriage ends a life of vice. What a temptation to abandon the hard work and the drudgery of service for such a career, of which she sees only the bright side. It is a temptation from which the State should save her. She should see prostitution as a degraded calling only, with its restrictions and inconveniences." The fact is, that the time has fully come for a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of English morality. The evidence which could be given would be startling.

It should be enacted that women who deliberately choose that life should be prohibited from appearing in the streets or at places of amusement. It is nonsense to say that this would be interfering with the liberty of the subject. When women choose to live that life, they should be made to know that, in the interests of the nation and mankind, as well as their own, they should be cut off from their fellow-creatures of both sexes. If this was done, there would soon be less disease and a better system of marriage.

The next great factor, in addition to a reduction in the number of youthful marriages, would be that of sexual temperance in the married. This would not only prove of considerable benefit to the health of those primarily concerned, but also would not fail to prevent, without anything immoral being done, an excess of population. *Evolution of Sex* says that in this, more than in artificial control of fertilization, the ideal of a proper balance of population is to be sought, in an ethical rather than in a mechanical prudence after marriage. "It seems to us essential to recognize that the ideal to be sought after is not merely a controlled rate of increase, but regulated married lives. We must protest against regarding artificial means of preventing fertilization as adequate solutions of sexual responsibility." By the adoption of temperance among the married we can have some hope for a solution of many of the difficulties by which we are at present surrounded. I quite admit, however, that a very long time must elapse before the less individuated will adopt it. A considerable period of self-control, and a full exercise of morality, must be undergone ere the more animal type will see the propriety and the necessity for a family of seven or eight children, instead of fourteen or sixteen. It is to the educated, to those who year by year are added to that desirable class, that we must look for improvement in this respect, especially to the women.

I do not see how it is possible to gainsay the fact that this is a matter in which their voices should be heard. Medical evidence is clear on the point. Indeed, it must strike everybody who thinks at all, that continual pregnancy saps the wife's health to a most deleterious degree, and also enfeebles the children born of such a mother. There are some women, we are thankful to know, still left us who can bear children without the least harm biennially, but they are the exception, not the rule. These women inherit the priceless blessings of rude health and a good constitution.

If a woman's health and happiness are worth anything at a man's hands, surely they are worth some amount of self-control and repression on his part. Yet I have known cases in which, after due medical warning had been given the husband that his wife's next confinement was impossible *per vias naturales*, or very perilous, yet he was brutal enough to kill her. We must endeavour to teach men of the lower animal types that to keep their bodies in temperance, sober-

ness, and chastity is just as necessary for the married as the unmarried. We must teach men that, although sexual impulse is more continuous in man than in any other animal, yet he has been given power to restrain and check it. The cynical Beaumarchais told us that the only thing which distinguished man from the beast was drinking without being thirsty, and making love at all seasons. Man can learn a lesson from the lower animals in this respect; their sexual impulses are not continuous, it is only at certain seasons that these come upon them. There are many biologists who teach that this was also the case with man in primitive times. Man had his pairing-time as well as all other animals in the earliest stages of his career, and gaining greater knowledge, he wished to prolong it, and did so. Biologists point to certain indications taking place even now which seem to bear them out.

The largest number of births in Europe always takes place in February, thus proving conception to have taken place at the usual pairing-time of all animals—May and June. Statistics amply prove that children born in the spring have far more vitality, and less mortality takes place among them, than children born at other times during the year. We need not enter any further into this point; all that we can lay to heart about it is, that when we look at the lower animals we see that their sexual intercourse is not possible to be carried on at all times as man's is, however it was brought about. (See Westermarck, and Giraud-Teulon's *Les Origines du Mariage et de la Famille*.)

We need not here indulge in the luxury of examining into all that has been written to prove that the origin of sex was in a hermaphrodite, and that all sexual impulse is but the attraction of one cell to the other from which it has been separated. "The more aggressive and impulsive among hermaphrodite types, exercising at last only the active half of their functions, have finally become males; the more passive and recipient, exercising at last only the accumulative and receptive half of their functions, have finally become females."

On the woman's side two incontrovertible facts stand out pointing to the truth of the idea which biologists entertain, that there was once a pairing-time amongst all animal nature. First, she is the only female animal in existence which menstruates monthly. This is a condition which seems unnatural. Why should she alone of all female animals be

condemned to this? Secondly, she can only conceive at certain times; at others, like the lower animals, she is sterile. All moralists, all physiologists, lay down that that knowledge ought to be taken advantage of by men to save their wives from continuous pregnancy. In this there cannot be the very least taint of immorality. It is merely adopting nature as a help, and if it was more wisely adopted there would be far less trouble than there is at present. It is merely acting in perfect accordance with a law of nature, and that law is also, be it remembered, God's law. The Jew knows it well. (See Leviticus xv. 19.)

The Christian World, writing on this point, says: "Apart from certain methods of limitation, the morality of which is generally questioned by many, there are certain easily-understood physiological laws, the failure to know and observe which is inexcusable on the part of either men or women in these circumstances." *Evolution of Sex* says the suggestion is obviously in harmony with that increased temperance which all must allow to be desirable. Taking due advantage of this useful knowledge, and combining it with temperance, would soon work out a very different state of things than there is at present, both for the poor overburdened woman and the terrible competition which results from an excess of population.

I think it was Mill who said that when an Englishman married such things as continence and temperance never entered into his head. Yet savage nations practise them to an extraordinary degree. The North-American Indians, the Malays, the Maories, the Ashantees, the Africans of Sierra Leone, all these not only abstain during the whole time of their wives' pregnancy, but until the child is able to walk or speak, amongst the Mconde till it speaks, and among the Fijians and all the Pacific islanders, as I have myself been told by them, until it is weaned. "Mr. Sceman, in his *Mission to Fiji*, tells us how horrified the natives of Fiji were to hear that children are born annually to Europeans. They thought that it explained why so many white people were mere shrimps." Civilized nations act otherwise, it can hardly be said for the better. It is a piteous spectacle to see an unfortunate woman condemned year after year to an excessive pregnancy, her strength, both physical and mental, being rapidly broken in upon and shattered. Not for a moment must it be admitted that a woman is bound to have as many

children as she can bear. If the laws of nature and God were observed and carried out by man, men would marry at thirty, women at twenty-five, and these would bear during twenty years ten children as an extreme limit, not fifteen or sixteen as we so often see now, when the age which the girl marries at is seventeen. No wife is bound to have as many children as she possibly can ; indeed, very much the reverse. She is perfectly justified in making use of the knowledge which has been granted to her, and which is quite in accordance with nature ; but she is not justified in adopting any means which are injurious to health, anything that can savour in the least degree of immorality, or which, interfering with conjugal relations, may drive her husband into immorality with other women.

Nature always punishes those who break her laws in some way ; and when we look upon an unfortunate woman of, say, thirty, having married at eighteen, with twelve children, worn out before her time, weak and enfeebled, we can see in her case an instance of a broken law of nature. When we look at her children, equally enfeebled, we can see an additional proof. We know what Sismondi wrote of such cases, how justice and humanity revolted against treating women so ; yet go to the mining country, go to the manufacturing districts, go to the fields, go anywhere, and you will see such women at every door, married at seventeen, old and broken down from too frequent child-bearing. All their vitality has been sapped, all that can make life pleasant and agreeable has been annihilated in them. Now active messengers of Neo-Malthusian doctrine are at work amongst them, and their propaganda is being rapidly adopted. The inequalities of wealth and utter disregard for temperance in sexual matters are rapidly driving the English nation into a national sin. If there were equally active messengers on the other side—that of morality—who would teach that by self-sacrifice, self-control, and a little necessary physiological knowledge, the same result, without anything immoral being done, could be equally well attained, it would be better for all. One would produce extinction of the nation, the other would produce a more powerful and moral one. People must learn that fewer children, born according to nature's law, a proper time having elapsed between each, are far better for the parents and the State than hordes of weakly, rickety children generated

annually, merely to afford profit to the undertaker. We are seeing the health of the nation deteriorating by such action both in the case of the mothers and the children. Professor Mayo Smith sums up the whole argument when he says that the proper course for the family and the nation to adopt is the birth of a sufficient number of healthy children to keep up family life and recruit the population without anything immoral being done. Gynecologists assert that a period of two years at least should elapse between each birth; this is now the exception, not the rule.

If mother nursed her child, I suppose it would be so, as it was in olden time; but now that artificial means of nursing are so widely adopted, the yearly birth amongst the reckless is the usual thing; hence excess of population, more or less enfeebled. It is unnatural. Surely temperance in sexual matters by the married is just as requisite as temperance in eating and drinking; all are fleshly lusts, and when we repress them, we are acting in accordance with the virtue of temperance. Men must learn that the children of continence are far healthier and wiser than the children of excess. Shakespeare knew this well when he wrote of the "dull, stale, tired beds, and the tribe of fops which had their origin in them." It is the cold-blooded woman, who is not sensual, who always bears the strongest and best children. Medical opinion is decisive that those who wish to have good issue should abstain for long periods, and also that those who do not do so through lack of self-control are precisely those who have the worst. We know what Montaigne tells us of his birth after many years continence by his parents, and also what Rousseau says of his birth after the same by his parents; the tendency always is for continence to produce the best type. Marshall says on this point of continence in the married: "It is best to marry early, provided there is sufficient self-control to keep the family within the requisite bounds without transgressing moral laws."

A well-known writer says that temperance in sexual matters is not to be found amongst the masses. That is so no doubt, at present, but it is the result of a lack of appeal to their better qualities, and also to a lack of instruction in the matters of sex. As I previously wrote, it is not owing to an impossibility or a disinclination to a higher standard of self-control and repression, but to sheer ignorance. I quite admit that

the improvement may, most probably will only be reached by persistent and long-continued efforts, but surely these will be better in the end than to follow the immoral and destructive counsels of the Neo-Malthusians. To proceed slowly, painfully, but with sound advance, to a more intellectual and moral improvement in these important matters of sexual morality, is far better for individual character than to give way to licentious immorality. By such means, self-control, which is the foundation of all moral improvement, both in the individual and the nation, will be drawn out and made effectual in all the sexual actions of life. The Neo-Malthusian is in too great a hurry to compass his ends; he destroys the higher feelings of the man, he appeals to his baser ones of selfishness and self-indulgence. He aims at the same desirable goal as we do, namely, a healthy, vigorous, properly-balanced condition of population; but his scheme sacrifices all that is best and noblest in human nature, his plan panders to what is mere lust and animalism. Better to reach our common aim by elucidating the nobler side of human nature than to acquiesce in its lower and corrupt one. His object can only be gained by self-abasement, ours by the exercise of those virtues which in the end would ennoble the man and the race. Surely it would be better for the married to learn the beauties of self-control than to degrade themselves by giving way to artificial restriction of their children, which latter can never be satisfactory to the conscience. That temperance and self-control in the married is absolutely needed must be admitted by all who think upon this matter of excess of population. Under the present unrestricted licence in married life women are compelled to bear children much too rapidly. A certain writer, who has paid much attention to the matter, says: "Internal discomfort arises, and by the time they have three or four children, the daily life has become a drudgery, a constant strain upon the nerve force. They strive to keep up to the mark by dram-drinking and tea-drinking. The one induces loss of self-respect and control and ends in utter degradation, the other induces horrible dyspepsia; mental depression steps in, and the constitution gradually gives way." How much misery, how much ill-health of both mother and child, would cease if boy-and-girl marriages were not the rule, and if self-control prevailed in married life both amongst rich and poor.

A poor, wretched, hard-working woman, not by any means utterly hardened, has been known to say, "I've had my fifteen on 'em, but, thank 'eaven, the churchyard has stood my friend!" What a hideous condition of selfishness and self-gratification in the man is represented by that saying, and what a miserable state of morality and religion, what an indifference to human life. The fact is, that the church is very much to blame for not teaching her people much more about sexual morality and elementary physiology than she does. She must be, if she fulfils her mission, a teaching church, addressing herself to all which comprises the man—his body, soul, and spirit; if she does not, she wofully fails in her duty to God and man. The problems of marriage, population, divorce, sexual purity, and vice, would very soon present very different aspects from what they do now, if the church was all things to all men that she might win some. The married have much to learn yet concerning the responsibility of producing other lives.

We are getting to know how much the health and minds of children depend upon the condition of their parents in these respects at the moment of conception. If children sound in mind and body are to be born, the health, the thoughts, the feelings of the parents must be perfect at that time. Yet how little attention is given to this most important point. We now know, beyond a doubt, that if either or both the parents are under the effects of alcohol at that time the child will run the gravest risk of being idiotic or epileptic. In the cases of these children there is a most peculiar arrest of growth and development of body. (See the *Lancet*, March 6th, 1869.) Hufeland very plainly says, in *The Art of Prolonging Life*: "In my opinion it is of the utmost importance that this moment should be confined to a period when the sensation of collected powers, ardent passion, and a mind cheerful and free from care, invite to it on both sides." The different appearances in the children of a family can be traced to the condition of the parents at the time of conception. Some will resemble the father, some the mother, both outwardly and inwardly. This truth is as old as Jacob's time. He seems to have acted with his flocks in the way he did as if it was the most natural thing in the world. Not a hint of such a thing as a miracle or especial strangeness is recorded about it. The Greeks understood this truth also.

Galen wrote graphically about it. (See Naphey's *The Physical Life of Woman*, p. 98.) In no other way can we account for the various differences in children and adults of the same family. If it be true, and there seems no doubt about it, that men and women while under the influence of alcohol at the moment of conception can affect the child, everything and anything else surely follows as a matter of course. Jacob knew it well; so do those who have paid the greatest attention to breeding prize cattle and thorough-bred horses. If such matters relating to the terrible responsibility of reproducing life were better understood and taught unreservedly, how different the question of population would be. Touching this point of temperance and self-control in the married, we may just remark that living separate lives by husband and wife has often been suggested, and no doubt adopted by some, but it is not to be encouraged. It is open to the objection that consent is seldom mutual, and also that the power to live such lives varies with the temperament of the two. Such a solution of the problems we are considering is very dangerous where either of them is possessed of strong passions. One more point remains to be discussed, it is that of second marriages, by which more children are called into life. These are never satisfactory, and Canon law forbade them both to clergy and laity alike. The former are forbidden to do so by the Greek Church. The stepmother is not generally a satisfactory person. Of course, amongst the poor they are almost a necessity; not so among the rich. It is to the widow that the case most applies. The man who marries a widow can never be sure that the children she bears him will either resemble him outwardly or mentally. Every breeder knows that if a thorough-bred female of any species has had for her first mate a low-bred specimen, she can never afterwards be relied upon to produce a perfect inheritor of her own purer-bred type. We have two remarkable instances of this rule of nature in the mule and the jennet. The former is the product of the he-ass and the mare, and is merely a large ass; the latter is the product of the she-ass and the horse, and is merely a small horse. (See also the Abbé Quillet's extraordinary books on this subject of callipœdia written two centuries ago.) It is the same in every kind of animal life. If a negress has had for her first husband a white man, and then marries for her second one of her own

race, she will often give birth to children by him marked with all the characteristics of the white race. Sometimes the colour of the child will approximate much more nearly to the white than to the coloured. We know the case of Darwin's zebra. Such a result is only to be expected. Marriage to a woman is such a complete transformation of life, such a great physiological change, that the man who brings it about for the first time is indelibly fixed upon her whole mind and constitution.

Our next consideration must be that of the marriage of the diseased, and consequently the multiplication of the unfit. That this is one of the most certain causes of undue competition and all manner of distress there cannot be the slightest doubt.

Life is of transcendent importance to everybody; it follows, therefore, that we should seriously consider what kind of life is brought into the world. But what little care there is expended upon this. "In point of health our children are our reproach. Where is there a healthy child? You may put before me a child in all its innocence. It has done no wrong that it should suffer. It may show to the unskilled mind no trace of disease, and yet I know that if I, or any skilled observer, were to look into the history of the life in question it cannot be found intrinsically sound." (Richardson.)

Those who have the misfortune to be diseased, either physically or mentally, are bound by all laws of morality not to perpetuate their defects. Abstinence from marriage is a duty they owe to themselves and society. It is impossible to imagine a greater wrong and injustice than to bring children into existence who are doomed to live lives of more or less suffering and agony. Yet we are all well aware, from the sights we see and the things we hear, how frequently this rule of simple morality and justice is utterly disregarded both by rich and poor alike. It may, with awful truth, be said to be more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Is it not terrible to see the daily increasing army of the helpless, the diseased, the idiotic, and the insane swarming into the world in countless numbers, these again in their turn to produce further swarms of still more diseased life? Greg writes, in *Malthus Notwithstanding*: "With us thousands with tainted constitutions, frames weakened with malady or waste, brains bearing subtle and hereditary mischief

in their recesses, are supplied, to transmit their terrible inheritance of evil to other generations."

There has never been a time when civilized society has not condemned such a state of things. Moral opinion and medical statements have all been thundered against it for ages; yet still it goes on unchecked, waxing more pernicious, more ghastly in its results every day. Mrs. Besant once stated that scientific materialism must forbid parentage to any but healthy couples. It does not need to be a scientific materialist to hold such an excellent belief; Christian morality teaches it and upholds it before all men. For centuries past, and especially in recent times, volumes have been written on the subject, showing that people, if they wish to act justly and morally, should earnestly ask themselves this important question, Will the world and society be the better for more of my life being brought into it?

According to the present code of thought, everybody, no matter what his mental or physical condition may be, is free to degrade human life. The result, of course, is what everybody deplores and condemns. Was there ever a more piteous sight than Charles Lamb leading away his insane sister by the hand from the inquest to guard for life, he himself bordering on the same condition? Who did sin, this man or his parents? We read of insane married persons going in and out of asylums, and yet procreating with the utmost freedom while they are outside; deaf and dumb intermarrying with one another, and their weddings described as so "interesting and pretty"; couples saturated with alcohol, steeped in consumption, stamped with syphilis, and marked with strumous ulcers, all propagating their like just as they please; idiots producing worse and worse forms of idiotcy, until we have at last reached a new product of civilization.

"A child that has no control over its involuntary muscles, that notices no light unless it be one of great intensity and brilliancy; that can stare the sun full in the face without winking; that prefers salt to sugar, the smell of assafoetida to the odour of the rose; that enjoys having its teeth pulled out, and is rapturous with the delight of being pricked with pins; that runs its fingers roughly along the sharp blade of a razor, and marvels with curious eyes at the sudden red flow from its severed flesh";—these are no creatures of imagination; they can be seen in hundreds at Elwyn. New,

horrible types of humanity are being produced in all directions; and yet the mischief goes on; nothing whatever is being done to hinder it.

If people would but think before they reproduce life and increase population! If people who would be likely to produce idiots would but refrain from piteous cruelty! "Of the idiots two-thirds are scrofulous, about twenty per cent. are paralysed, about the same proportion crippled and deformed, some out of all resemblance to humanity, a like number are blind, and as many more mute. A large number of these creatures are more degraded than any brute-beast. Their habits are beyond description. They know nothing of pleasure and little of peace. Indeed, a large number are wholly incapable of experiencing pleasurable feelings. The only sensations which they experience in their course through life are painful, and when not in pain their lives are as void of sensation as that of a cabbage. Their lives may be said to be vegetable, with the unfortunate power added of experiencing pain. These trebly-cursed creatures only exist to suffer. Their existence is a dark pathway from the cradle to the grave, punctuated by periods of suffering, but not illuminated by a single ray of pleasure." Shakespeare says: "The miserable have no other medicine, but only hope"; but these, the miserable of the miserable, are denied even the pleasures of hope; for them there is no hope. These poor creatures are the results of unions which should not take place.

Disraeli wrote against all this dreadful sin and degradation in *Lothair*, saying that it was the first duty of a good government to attend to the frame and health of the subject, and how the Spartans understood their duties in such respects. They permitted no marriages the probable consequences of which might be an enfeebled progeny. The fate of the nation will ultimately depend upon the health and vigour of its population. If something effectual is not done to curtail the deterioration we are rapidly falling into, a very dreadful state of things must ensue. Those who have to consult a doctor know very well that the first question they are asked is, What is the family history? Those who insure their lives know how full are the questions they have to answer about the health of their relatives. It is not from ignorance that people marry who ought not; it is from want of self-control, and thorough perverseness. "Such marriages as these, which bear fruit in idiots and lunatics, and

the deformed and warped in body as well as mind, are things accursed by the law of nature and nature's God, and should be accursed by the law of man."

One of the worst features of all this reckless and unwise procreation is that the wise, the prudent, the self-controlled have to pay largely for the lack of these virtues in others by maintaining their multitudes of diseased and helpless productions. What can be done to stem this horrible state of things? Whatever the future may bring, we have not yet arrived at the time when we can isolate or sterilize the diseased and the criminal members of the human race, nor can we adopt lethal chambers or infanticide. We are told that out of all this mixture the fittest will eventually evolve, and all will be well; that out of it all will emerge a perfect humanity, the culminating point of evolution, a perfect man. It seems difficult to foresee it, for diseased life is being now everywhere assisted to prolong itself in endless successions of human beings. Science may, in ages to come, succeed in discovering a mode of transferring disease into health, but for the immediate future the outlook is very dark. The solution of the many difficulties involved is indeed hard to discover. We can only appeal at present to the moral feelings, especially to those of women. To them the appeal for mercy to children will never be made in vain. If by neglecting, or setting justice, mercy, and reason at defiance, men and women have perversely reproduced their own tainted lives, the cure will certainly not be found in adding cruelty to cruelty, injustice to injustice, by illtreating and destroying in lethal chambers, which some advocate, the terrible productions which have been brought into the world.

In considering the problems of the multiplication of the unfit, we must steadily bear in mind that often, far too often, these untoward productions are the evil results of human life having been forced, by an unnatural condition of society, into surroundings which have tended in no slight degree to produce them in the first instance. The cure for it all can only be found in recalling men and women to those paths of morality and righteousness from which they have, either wilfully or ignorantly, stepped aside. To cure one evil by putting another deliberately into its place is certainly not improvement. To destroy unfit life would only be increasing human agony to a frightful extent. Infanticide would be less painful. But surely

we have arrived at the time when all must admit that moral methods to obtain improvement are better than those of brute strength. How many poor, suffering creatures would be driven to despair and suicide if they thought that the lethal chamber awaited them. Neither can we isolate those who are unfit to reproduce their species; the cost would be too great, and the rebellion by those primarily concerned too widespread to be overcome. No, the appeal to stop these horrors can only be made by a Christian society to the moral feelings of mankind, not to its lower, more brutal ones.

The time has undoubtedly come when that appeal can, with some degree of hope, be addressed to those who have acquired a high degree of justice, righteousness, and morality. These can be appealed to by such means to refrain from marriage if unfit. With regard to those who have, unfortunately, only acquired a lower standard of these virtues, legislators can do something. They can point out to them the serious injury they are doing to themselves and everybody else by propagating the unfit. This they can do by affording them the necessary information they now are so sadly in lack of, and which would greatly remove the trouble. I am confident such methods would not be adopted in vain. There is sufficient conscience in all men and women, no matter how blunted and distorted it may be, which, if awakened, would convince them that to reproduce their own unfortunate lives in others is a grievous sin against God, nature, and morality.

In this matter of the multiplication of the unfit, we can readily observe another instance of how adverse to the prosperity of the nation are the social influences of this evil generation upon which we are fallen. Many men and women best calculated to reproduce lives which would be the glory and boast of England are prevented from doing so in consequence of the lack of means; yet immense numbers of those who are totally unfit to reproduce theirs, and to whom economic hindrances have no power of appeal, do not hesitate to do so. Hence, of course, arises the survival of the unfittest. The time has come when clergy and doctors must unite in appealing to all to rise to a higher standard of morality in marriage, and all things relating thereto. People must be made to understand that where prudence in marriage is cruelly disregarded, and proper consideration for children miserably outraged, nature, which is God's law, will infallibly assert itself,

and cause millions, who ought not to be so doomed, to suffer years of agony. "It is time, therefore, as we heard a brave parson tell his flock lately, to have done with that blasphemous whining which constantly tries to look at a motherless and fatherless crowd of puny infants as a dispensation of mysterious providence." (*Evolution of Sex*.)

People who are unfit to marry must be taught that, instead of making life a blessing to others, they would, by their selfish action, transform it into a curse. "These persons' lives are a curse to themselves, and a cause of incessant suffering to their best friends. When at length they succumb, all who cared for them rejoice. Most people can picture for themselves what the latter end of such a life is. The diseased one, an object of horror and loathing to those who love him most, praying (when not stupefied with drugs to deaden his pain) to God for relief in death; while those around echo the prayer in hiding, and become impatient that their united prayers have remained so long unanswered." Who, possessed of an atom of pity or morality, would not refrain from bringing such lives into the world? The time will assuredly come when a medical certificate declaring fitness for marriage will be considered as necessary as the certificate stating that the banns have been published. It will be considered admirable self-denial, sound wisdom, and which will become more and more apparent as life draws on, for the diseased, or those with a tendency to disease, to abstain from marriage both on moral and physical grounds. We are all bound to teach and maintain that it is an undoubted sin for diseased people to marry; that they will, in doing so, be guilty of a great wrong against the children whom they would bring into the world, and also of an outrage against all the higher laws of morality. "Few would deserve better of their country than those who determine to live celibate lives, through a reasonable conviction that their issue would probably be less fitted than the generality to play their part as citizens." (Galton.)

We can look forward with some degree of confidence to the cessation of all these wrongs if we appeal to the humane and moral feelings of mankind. Public opinion will also be of much help; sometimes it is of much force; when it has right on its side it is irresistible. In no holier cause can its help be invoked than in this. The time will undoubtedly come when a purer and more sensitive morality will look askance on those

who will persist in committing the great crime of propagating unfit life. Mill's aphorism—cynical, heartless as it is, and which need not be repeated here—may then be applied to all those who, contrary to all feelings of mercy and consideration for others, act so unwisely and unnaturally. 'The selfish man will no doubt always gratify his fleshly lusts, regardless of the misery and sufferings which he will by so doing inflict upon others, whom he dooms to live and perish miserably. The moral man will refrain, he "whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience"; and when his life's work is done, he will have the blessed satisfaction of knowing that, by self-sacrifice and denying himself, he has lessened the sum of human agony. The Neo-Malthusian steps in here with his arguments, and says that the adoption of his system would enable the diseased to marry, and that if exception be taken to its practice on economic grounds, such as limiting the power of production, it cannot apply here, as the children born would do more harm than good. Well, of course, under his system they could marry, and the world would be none the worse by the multiplication of their unfit, but morality would apply to their case just as much as to the sound when they adopt it.

I leave it to those who ought not to marry to consider which is the most righteous and moral course to adopt—to give licence to sexual passion in an immoral manner merely to gratify a fleeting sensation, or to deny oneself for the sake of a higher code of morals and religion. The one would bring a stricken conscience and remorse in the end, the other would bring peace and satisfaction. Dr. Holmes says on this particular point: "Those who know that they would transmit diseased bodies and weakened predispositions to their offspring should choose voluntary celibacy. How much more honourable is such a course, and typical of a higher education and moral training, than is the example set by many who claim to be leaders of modern society and civilization, who have acquired the knowledge that enables them to enjoy the intoxications of wedlock without being parents." And now I trust I have sufficiently dealt with those three most necessary reforms in marriage, which would, if adopted, tend so materially to reduce the manifold troubles which we are now suffering from, caused by an excess of population. First, cessation of immature marriages; secondly, temperance in the married;

and thirdly, only healthy couples to marry. None of these reforms involve the least trace of immorality, and would be productive of far more good to the individual and the race than Neo-Malthusianism. The former would bring out the best qualities of human nature; the latter would degrade it.

NEO-MALTHUSIANISM WITH REGARD TO THE LAND QUESTION.

IN considering this aspect of the matter I do not intend to enter into the very complex matter of Land Nationalization. That has been already sufficiently dealt with by Professor Wallace in his successful book, *Land Nationalization*. That something of the kind must come in time is sufficiently clear, but the settlement is not for our generation. Those who come after us will see vast changes in the tenure of land, and will smile with contempt at the manner in which we carried on the affair ; but in the meantime there are very many minor reforms in this matter of land tenure which could easily be effected, and which would undoubtedly be of much present utility in reducing many of the troubles arising from the plethora of population which has arisen in our modern life, and consequently would minimise the so-called necessity for the practice of Neo-Malthusianism. We may follow the precept of the poet who wrote :—

“ To do the thing we can, and not presume
To fret because it's little.”

It seems to me, as indeed it must do to all who know anything about, or take any interest in land questions, that if there was a better cultivation of the soil, as well as a firmer and longer tenure, many of the difficulties and troubles which necessarily arise from the present congested condition of population would be at least mitigated. (Owing to the lack of technical instruction in scientific agriculture, the British farmer is far behind the times. By nature he is slow to take advantage of inventions, and pecuniarily he is unable to do so. Combined hostile influences force him to keep on in the old style of agriculture which was in vogue a century ago, and consequently, in the competition with others better situated in

these respects than he is, he comes to the ground. He is the most conservative of mortals, and is loth to move with the times. Moreover, he fights for his own hand, and resents any interference which might show to the outside world what position he was in. Anxious to assist farming interests, the railway companies lately made an effort to carry agricultural produce at as low rates as could be made to pay; but this necessitated a concerted action on the part of the farmers, which they do not seem so far to be able to attain to. Naturally the Railway Companies could carry a large quantity at one time, from one station, easier and cheaper than many small quantities from many small stations at different times. Yet the system has failed because the farmers seemed unable just to make this combined effort to send their goods from one point instead of from many. Yet we hear a vast amount of complaint that the producer cannot get his produce to the consumer in consequence of railway difficulties. We often read disheartening letters in the newspapers, written by despairing small cultivators, stating that all the possible profits on a consignment of perishable commodities are lost through delay in transit; and yet, when the opportunity was given of not losing them, the want of co-operation amongst the farmers wrecked the possibility of helping them. It was not the custom of proceeding in olden times, hence the difficulty of the modern farmer to grasp the improvement. Moreover, he despises technical education. It is with the utmost difficulty that classes are got together to teach those who would profit by it most. We read of many country villages where no classes can be held in consequence of utter indifference.

In almost everything connected with agriculture we need improvement and reform. What can, for instance, be more absurd and hindering to successful cultivation than that a man who farms land should never be certain that he would not be obliged to surrender it all, owing to some whim of his landlord, at a six months' notice? It is a great hindrance to an increased production of the soil, that whatever a tenant may put into the soil with a view to its improvement belongs to the landlord. Who, under such a system, would be so foolish as to plant orchards? Who seems at the present time to have any interest in causing the land to produce its very utmost? Nobody. Hence the poor suffer; the yeoman and

the peasant flee from the country, and become mere wage-earners in the towns. Mr. Wallace proposed that after all existing lives interested in possessing land die out it should become the property of the State. The proposal was met by cries that it was robbery and disinheritance. But how many younger sons at the present time are being disinherited of any share in their father's land by the ridiculous law of entail; the eldest son succeeds to an inheritance in land which he cannot maintain or improve, as he is a mere figure-head, the nominal owner of a part of the soil which he cannot spend any money upon to improve; hence all interested in extreme production suffer. Can anything be more absurd, in these days of agricultural depression, than a tenant for life? If he has younger children, he naturally does all he can to save all that is possible for them, to the terrible detriment of the land. He has consequently no money to spend upon buildings, or in improving the soil. In the meantime all connected with it suffer, every sort of harm is incurred, merely to uphold a territorial family and pride, which latter is really as hurtful to the persons most concerned themselves as it is to others. The tenant for life leads but a dreary life after all—he cannot look upon his estate as really his, he is hampered on every side, unable to make the land produce all it could. Hence all the decay of agriculture and the exodus to the town. Everybody connected with the cultivation of the soil becomes more and more dispirited, and gives it up. If agriculture is at all to succeed in England, the old ideas will have to be trampled upon, especially that one which treats everything put into the soil as the property of the landlord. Who would plant that another might reap? Nobody with a grain of sense would improve another man's property. If the owners of English land intend to hold their own with the rest of the world, they must abolish all absurd restrictions with regard to its cultivation, and part with what they cannot cultivate or improve themselves to those who can. In time—the sooner the better, if the land of England is not to go out of cultivation altogether—the State will have to take over large quantities of practically ownerless land, and let it to tenant labourers, who could become the owners after having paid, in course of years, the necessary rent, plus a sinking fund to repay any money advanced. All this combined would be less than the present rent, which seems to be productive of no good to anybody.

Take the case of a landlord, the nominal owner of an impoverished estate, with no margin of profit after all outgoings are paid, unable to spend a penny on improvements. Would it not be better for him, and especially for the land, that the State should take it up and deal with it? This system is being adopted in Ireland with excellent results. Why should it not be the same in England?

We should also work to remove the grievous injustice connected with local taxation, and which so greatly hinders all improvement in the cultivation of land. Most of these should be paid from Imperial and not from local sources. A vast number of people who have large fortunes invested in consols, railways, etc., contribute nothing whatever to local taxation. For instance, a man with £10,000 a year from such sources, paying, let us say, £500 a year for a house and gardens, only pays local rates on £500, the remainder, £9500, escapes scot-free; while the man who has all his money coming from land pays on every penny of it. Is this justice? Is it fair to the land? Is it fair to anything connected with it? The reason, of course, is obvious. When these taxes were imposed there was only the land as a means of investment, such things as modern modes of investment were unheard of; yet, notwithstanding the revolution which all such affairs have undergone during the present century, we stand to-day in the same mode of taxation with regard to land as we did a hundred or more years ago. Is it not ridiculous? Even in the present time, at the present moment, we see numbers of people, who ought to know better, zealously eager to impose all financial school support on the rates, instead of on Imperial sources. This idea of rate-aid is simply adding additional burdens to the land. The question arose which would be best, rate or Imperial aid, and many short-sighted individuals voted for local rather than Imperial taxation. Under this pernicious system of piling on local taxation, the land of England has no chance of successfully competing with land which has now, by means of better transit, been brought into close proximity, and which has none of these heavy burdens to bear.

The improvement of our mercantile shipping, the vast extension of foreign railways, and other obvious causes, have had the result that the harvests of the world can be brought from places where they are produced, and sold in countries where they are required, at a price only a little above that in

the country of their origin. Yet, notwithstanding all the foreign competition which we have to contend against now, every hindrance to the land producing its utmost is still maintained, and everything is put in the way of those who would be glad to make it to do so. For instance, if the tenant of an arable farm transformed it into a garden to supply fruit, vegetables, etc., instantly the rate-collector pounces upon him, and informs him that he must pay three times the rates he did formerly; when he has departed, the tithe-owner calls upon him, and tells him his tithe must now be extraordinary, instead of ordinary, as his land is now garden. Is it any wonder that under such systems of taxation the land of England is fast becoming useless? The case of ground landlords is very monstrous. Although they derive enormous incomes from houses built upon their land, yet they contribute nothing whatever towards local taxation. Is this as it should be, is it fair to the land? A few figures will show how unjust the present system of taxation for the poor-rate is. The total income of England and Wales now amounts to about £600,000,000, yet the poor-rate is charged upon only £50,000,000; so that no less than £450,000,000 escapes all taxation towards the £18,000,000 raised for the poor-rate. The time has certainly come when, if the land of England is not to go out of cultivation altogether, a radical reform will have to take place in the removal of some of the taxes which press so heavily upon the land, and placing them on Imperial sources. When any attempt is made to remove the poor-rate from local to Imperial sources, an immediate outcry is made that the cost of maintaining the poor would largely increase, owing to the lack of local representation and management, for the men who are elected Guardians of the Poor have a natural interest in keeping down the cost. It is somewhat difficult to see why the cost should so increase. The management might remain the same, and none of the Guardians would be more likely to adopt measures which would tend to increase their income taxation than to increase their local one. The only difference would be, that then the tax would be distributed over a larger number of contributors than it is at present.

Another great help to the land would be to replace the duty on malt. When it was placed on beer, barley fell ten shillings a quarter at once. It was placed on beer to the detriment of

both the farmer and the consumer of beer. As much beer is drunk now as ever there was, but other matters besides barley are put into it.

Again, what greater hardship can there be than in forcing the farmers, and all interested in land, to maintain the roads. Surely those who use them most should do so. I am told that since the days of turnpikes brewers have added enormously to their incomes. They make use of the roads more than any other class, yet they contribute nothing to their maintenance now. We see the absurdity of this present system in the case of the clergy, who do not, generally speaking, use the roads very much, yet pay as much as others who use them very much more. All land-tax should be expended on the parishes from which it is drawn, instead of being transmitted elsewhere, as it is now.

A great reform will have to take place in the mode of tenure. Besides all the local taxation which the land has at present to bear, we have no less than four classes to maintain out of it—the landlord, the farmer, the clergy, and the labourer. Is this possible under present conditions, when, owing to improved modes of communication, we have very distant parts of the globe as near to London now as Liverpool was fifty years ago? Yet the present system still continues, with the inevitable result that the land of England is going out of cultivation; it cannot continue, under the present system, to be worked at all.

The following statistics, just published by the American Department of Agriculture, prove how greatly English land is ceasing to be productive:—

NUMBER OF ACRES UNDER WHEAT FOR EACH
100 INHABITANTS.

America	230
Russia	200
Argentina	150
Denmark	150
Roumania	140
Canada	130
Austria	100
France	100
Germany	75
Italy	70
Belgium	40
United Kingdom	26

The wheat grown for each inhabitant in the following countries amounts to :—

America	2,400 lbs.
Denmark	2000 „
Canada	1500 „
Russia	1200 „
France	1000 „
Germany	900 „
Belgium	600 „
Ireland	500 „
Italy	400 „
Great Britain	350 „

These figures go to prove that English land has no chance, borne down as it is with local taxation, and four classes to support out of it, of successfully competing with countries where none of this outrageous taxation exists. During the last twenty years no less than 2,137,000 acres of arable land have been lost in the United Kingdom. In the year 1875 there were four million acres under wheat; in 1895 only one and a half. In 1870 the wheat crop amounted to fourteen million quarters; in 1895 it was below five. In 1870 the price per quarter of wheat amounted to fifty-five shillings; in 1895 to about a pound. In 1870 the value of the whole wheat crop of the United Kingdom amounted to thirty-six millions sterling; in 1895 it was only five millions and a half. These figures prove how the land of England is going out of cultivation as regards cereals. Levasseur shows us how England was supplied with wheat during the year 1889 :—

Russia	4,264,335 qrs.
United States	3,403,250 „
India	1,843,466 „
Roumania	572,497 „
Germany	507,725 „
Australia	281,212 „
Canada	23,366 „

“Even England, which is the most advanced agricultural country, has an extent of unproductive fields equal to a fifth of its whole surface.” (Nitti.) It has been ascertained that each person in the United Kingdom consumes five bushels of wheat per annum. When we consider, then, that an area of England equal to five times the size of Devonshire could produce seven bushels of wheat to every person in England this moment,

we can readily imagine from this what the United Kingdom, if it was properly cultivated, could produce. The merest child knows very well that England could produce million-folds more than it does. We import each year on an average as much as 119,000,000 lbs. of dairy produce, all of which could be produced in England. Belgium easily supports, out of her own produce, a population of 533 to the square mile; England has to import immense quantities of food to support 483. Without taking into consideration any other foods, there were no less than £22,531,176 worth of wheat imported into Great Britain during the year 1895. All of this could easily be produced at home. During that year the total value of all kinds of human food imported into the United Kingdom, not an atom of which could not be produced at home, amounted to £147,778,866. What a different country England would be if she kept that sum of money at home instead of giving it to others! All that she needs to do so is a fair chance, which she has not now. We are told that the farmer of the far West declares that he can grow wheat to pay at a shilling a bushel, and that two shillings and a penny give him a large profit. We may gather from this what England has to expect. The carriage of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool only amounts to two shillings and twopence per quarter, or nine shillings and ninepence a ton. (See, for further information on this point, the article, "Can the Empire feed its people?" in the *Nineteenth Century* for January, 1896.) The impossibility of growing cereals under the present systems of land tenure and taxation has changed the whole aspect of England. Arable land is being everywhere converted into permanent pasture. This, of course, does away with the labourer; hence we have the rural exodus, the depopulation of the country, the accumulation in the towns. The present proportion of arable to pasture land in the following countries is:—

	FRANCE.	GERMANY.	BELGIUM.	UNITED KINGDOM.
Arable	. 49'20 ...	48'46 ...	53'48 ...	29'17
Pasture	. 11'02 ...	12'07 ...	13'19 ...	32'08

If the soil of England was cultivated as that of Belgium or France is, and much of the unfair local taxation was transferred to Imperial sources, if the absurd and antiquated rules concerning its possession were abrogated, if a general reform

all round would only take place, England could feed many millions more from her own resources than she does now. This is what the *Coming Reign of Plenty* says :---

"If the soil of the United Kingdom were cultivated only as it was thirty years ago, 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000, could live on home-grown food ; and that culture, while giving occupation to at least 750,000 men, would give nearly 3,000,000 wealthy home customers to the British manufacturers.

"If the 1,590,000 acres on which wheat was grown thirty years ago—only these, and not more—were cultivated as the fields are cultivated now in England under the allotment system, which gives on the average forty bushels per acre, the United Kingdom would grow food for 27,000,000 inhabitants out of 35,000,000.

"If the now cultivated area of the United Kingdom—80,000 square miles—were cultivated as the soil is cultivated on the average in Belgium, the United Kingdom would have food for 37,000,000 inhabitants, and it might export agricultural produce, without ceasing to manufacture, so as freely to supply all the needs of a wealthy population.

"And, finally, if the population of this country came to be doubled, all that would be required for producing the food for 70,000,000 inhabitants would be to cultivate the soil as it is cultivated in the best farms of Lombardy and Flanders, to cultivate the fields, which at present lie almost unproductive, around the big cities in the same way as the neighbourhoods of Paris are cultivated by the Paris *maraischers*."

Anybody who looks at allotment grounds and sees all the produce there, and then looks over the hedge and sees the condition of the ordinary farmed land, can well realize what good and bad farming means, what the soil of England is capable of producing when well treated. If it was, the United Kingdom could supply 140,000,000 of mouths with wheat. And yet at the present time, owing to all the restrictions heaped up upon our land, we have actually to import food from other countries at a cost of over £140,000,000 a year, all of which could be saved to our population if access to the land and freedom of dealing with it were granted. To appreciate the meaning of all this better, we may learn that at the present time there are no less than 27,000,000 acres of land in Great Britain lying waste, a fifth of its whole surface, most of which could be

more or less cultivated with considerable profit. Yet the towns are crowded with unemployed, starving people. Surely there is a fault somewhere.

With reference to the number of classes which are supported directly out of the land, it is impossible that that number—the landlord, the farmer, the clergy, the labourer—can continue to be maintained; one must go—which is it to be? The landlord cannot; he would if he could, as, alas! the possession of land has ceased to become either a happiness or a source of wealth to him; the clergy cannot, although they groan under the present loss of tithe; and there must be the labourer to till the ground; the farmer is alone left. Everything points to him as the present useless appendage to the soil, and the reasons why he is so are sufficiently obvious. The landlord in the future will have to deal directly with a newly-created class, but which is really not so, as none other existed down to the Hanoverian period. The class of tenant labourers will have to be revived, a class of men who, with the assistance of their relatives and households, will be able to properly cultivate a small farm.

The land of England cannot continue any longer, under present competition with foreign produce, to directly support three classes—landlord, farmer, and labourer; but it could two—landlord and tenant labourer. The time will not come in our day when only one class, the owner, will both hold and cultivate it. In the meantime we must abolish the middleman, the farmer, in the modern sense of the word, and introduce the tenant labourer, who really is the yeoman of old days. In having his own family to help, he will avoid most, if not all, external labour expenses. It is in these small farms of fifteen to fifty acres each to which we can look for alleviation of our present stress of population. The present farms are far too large; no farmer is able to do his duty to the land, which, under such untoward circumstances, does not produce all it could do if it had all the advantages which an ample fertilization affords. The labourer is crying out for more and more land, and says that, notwithstanding all the present competition, he could live well out of it, and in addition pay a sufficient rent. The proof of this is the extraordinary demand there is for allotments by the labourers, which the farmers are always loth to grant, and which they look askance at, knowing that if the demand was granted, the labourers would

not be forthcoming when the farmers needed them for their own sowing and reaping. The half system suggested by some, namely, that the labourer should work three days with the farmer and three days for himself, is absurd; it never could answer, as when the busy time came each interest would conflict. There can be nothing between the labourer working altogether for the farmer at a miserable pittance, with plots of ground for allotments and a garden, out of which there never can be any rise of condition for him, and a tenant labourer on a small farm. We will consider later on what might be the most suitable size of these farms.

The dual system could never be satisfactory to either party. It would be returning to the boon service of feudal times, when the villein was forced to harvest the lord's crops at the expense of his own. The tenant labourer and his family would require sufficient land to occupy their time all the year round, and that would seem to be about fifteen to fifty acres. If it be said that such a class of men could not undertake such farms without some capital, I reply, that under the system of advance from the State now proved so very satisfactory in Ireland, where the Arcadia of farming seems to be setting in at last, this could be done, and repaid in a term of years. The only difficulty that might arise in the small farm scheme would be a lack of farm-buildings at first; but that difficulty might be met by temporary ones at the beginning, and more durable ones later on; besides, there are many larger-sized cottages which could be utilized. (See an admirable article on small farms by Lord Wantage in *The Fortnightly Review*.) Even if the tenants or proprietors of these proposed small farms were obliged to live in the village, some distance from the farm, they would be very willing, and indeed eager, to accept them on such terms. In many cases, at the present time, farm labourers on an estate or farm have to tramp long distances to and from their work night and morning merely for a pittance of wage. How different the case would be if the man walked to and from his own land, and how different the interest in each case. Again, in the present days of such abundance of capital, where no satisfactory investments can be had, would not a purchase of fifty acres of land be better than the sweet simplicity of the two per cents.?

Another great disadvantage to the successful treatment of the land of England is the mode of purchase and transfer.

If the soil could be bought and sold in the open market as other possessions are, how much better it would be. What can be more absurd than the antiquated load of legal jargon with which it is considered necessary to surround all present transfers of land? No matter how small the plot may be, folios of written matter, bearing enormous legal expenses, seem necessary. In the Middle Ages half-a-dozen lines conveyed a territory, as anybody can see who has an antiquarian acquaintanceship with old deeds and charters. All these needless expenses and hindrances to purchasing land act as very great preventatives to persons acquiring it, although in many cases they are anxious to do so; they disgust the would-be purchaser. How much better for the land, and all who might desire to purchase any of it, that a twenty-five years' undisputed possession at the present could give a registration title. This could be lodged in the County Court, and be visible to any intending purchaser. Even those most interested in the matter—the lawyers—admit that conveyancing has become a chaos.

Thorold Rogers told us that the conveyance of real estate in the United Kingdom is mulcted in law charges, exclusive of taxes, to the extent of £12,000,000 annually. Imagine what a help there would be towards the better production of the soil if such a useless expenditure was abolished. If we look at countries which we foolishly consider to be behind us in such things, we can see how for centuries past land-transfer there has been conducted with very small expense, yet in the most satisfactory and expeditious way. I need not expatiate upon them here; they will be found in that most valuable Report of Mr. C. Fortescue Brickdale, of the Land Registry Office. He was commissioned by the Government to report on the systems of land-transfer in Germany and Austria-Hungary. He tells us that the whole cost of transferring an estate, the price of which is £5000, is only four pounds five shillings; compare that with what it would be under our present system in England. No effort is made to diminish all the adverse and hindering influences which are destroying English agriculture, and consequently increasing the misery of the towns. Many of those most versed in agricultural knowledge say that, in this proposed scheme of returning to yeoman and small farms, there is a very great possibility of recovery for English land. the present time we see large isolated farmhouses, sur-

rounded by farm-buildings more or less dilapidated, inhabited by a class of men who cannot pay their way under present conditions, and who are altogether out of their true social position, living in a style altogether out of proportion to their dwindling incomes. On the other hand, under the small farm system, we would see moderately-sized buildings, and far more than the present isolated ones, inhabited by families who all worked on the farms in the true sense of the word. Owing to the demands made upon them, and made in consequence of their fictitious social position, the farmer's wife and daughters now live altogether out of their proper sphere. If the tenant labourer could step in, his wife and daughters would merely resume the life Englishwomen of that class lived in days gone

Nobody knew English life better than Richard Jefferies, and his writings on this point may well be studied with profit. We have arrived at the time, for good or evil, which the earlier economists of this century predicted would arrive, and which they condemned, when we would be entirely dependent on foreign produce for our food, and home cultivation is consequently being utterly neglected. It was not until after the time of the Great Rebellion that the present pernicious system of farmer and labourer arose. Formerly these two classes were combined in one; that class which only held enough land for one family to cultivate. Afterwards, when things began to settle down, and agriculture became very profitable, there arose the ruinous system of a man taking more land than he and his family could cultivate, and keeping others to do it. These latter then became mere wage-earners, instead of being directly supported out of the land as they previously had been. If we study the history of those times, especially the literature of Parish Enclosures, we can readily see the origin of much of our present-day troubles; and yet there is much hesitation now exhibited to return to the system which preceded the present evil generation, and which answered so remarkably well in former days. "The first step taken was to divide the land in parcels amongst those who had formerly shared in the whole, and it was not long before the adding of field unto field, often by right of force or fraud rather than by law, to the possessions of the larger landlords, created throughout rural England a landless multitude where such had never before existed, who were left to the precarious livelihood which wage-

labour provided." When, under the present absurd system, the collective power of the labourers is prevented from being utilized on the land, and wages are given instead, both the labourers and the land suffer.

There is no land question, no rural exodus, no rural poverty problem whatever in Japan, which we still foolishly consider to be an uncivilized country. Why are there not such things in Japan? Simply because in Japan everybody has some land to cultivate and profit by. The Japanese are not divorced from the soil, as the English are, by means of the absurd and antiquated restrictions prevailing with regard to land tenure and purchase. Whenever a population is prevented from having its due and proper share of the land, out of which are derived all the necessities of life in abundance, so long will there be privation and misery in the towns. The slaves and the serfs of bygone times were far better off than the present class of English agricultural labourers are now; the former had plenty to eat and drink, the latter are half starved. The agricultural rents of England amount to about £16,000,000 a year; the number of agricultural labourers is about 750,000. This speaks volumes as to which class receives most from the soil. The wages of the latter amount to about twelve shillings a week. As long as the agricultural labourer is a mere wage-earner he loses all interest in the soil; if he had some of it to cultivate, he would have a link to bind him to it, and would not rush to the towns and factories as he is doing now, with such evil results to himself and the general population.

Loria says that all evils arising from an excess of population are the results of adverse economics with regard to land. The whole aspect of the matter is transformed when the agricultural labourers are given the possibility of acquiring land for themselves. Many a man who is farming a few acres says, "I am getting on very well, and have nothing to complain of. Yet my neighbour, the large farmer, with five hundred acres, says he cannot live. Is it not strange?" The reason of this is obvious. One has only sufficient land to work well, and has sufficient capital and strong arms to do it with; the other has far too much, and is obliged to employ others to work for him, and in nine cases out of ten has only enough of capital to work a hundred instead of five hundred acres. Such men give vent on all possible occasions to a last despairing cry—Protection; but is it likely that the millions

of consumers in England would consent to pay more for their food than they need, merely to bolster up directly the farmer and indirectly the landlord? Protection may be suitable for other countries not situated as England is; for her it is utterly impossible. England has become, for weal or woe, a vast hive of manufacturers, sending out their manufactured products to all parts of the earth, and receiving back their food, or the means to acquire it with, instead. If those who term themselves Protectionists would seriously consider the questions involved, they would easily see that Free Trade is absolutely necessary for England's existence. We import raw material from every part of the globe, we manufacture it, and sell it to the world; in other words, we sell our work, so that if any hindrance was placed on the importation of the raw material, it would act as a preventative to our obtaining wages. Whether or not it would be better for the population of a country to be entirely agricultural, and not manufacturing, is a question which it is not my object to discuss. We purchase at present about £30,000,000 worth of cotton in a year; we sell about £55,000,000 worth of cotton manufactured goods. The difference, namely, £25,000,000, represents what we earn by the transformation. With regard to the import of food, we must buy that in the best and cheapest market, whether that be at home or abroad. English rents and taxes render it cheaper now, owing to improved transit, in the foreign than in the home markets, for distance has no longer to be considered. This is a fact which all connected with land must realize. England can still produce as much wheat as ever it did. The soil has in no degree whatsoever deteriorated. If both farmers and labourers, those two classes now most interested in the soil, were to unite in saying that all hope of improvement had gone by for ever for English land, under the present economic and free trade conditions, and that a better production than there is now was impossible, the future of English agriculture would be dark indeed; but, on the other hand, we find the latter (and who ought to know better?) giving us the most positive assurances and proofs that the soil could be made to produce much more abundantly than it does, and that they could easily do it if they were given a chance of dealing with it. The earth-hunger now exhibited by all agricultural labourers throughout the kingdom is most remarkable. That class knows very well what the soil is capable of,

and never loses a chance of acquiring some of it when the opportunity offers. Let us take, for instance, the case of a parish in Essex, which county, we all know very well, is suffering from the most tremendous form of agricultural depression. The Parish Council of Burnham-on-Crouch took over on agreement with the owner twenty acres of land at a rental of two pounds an acre, and cut this up into allotments, varying in size, and re-let them at £2 13s. 6d. an acre. Tenants were immediately found for every plot, yet they had to pay in addition the local rates, which amount to four and sixpence an acre. Is it not ridiculous, then, for farmers holding large farms in the same county to say that farming cannot be made to pay even if they had the land rent-free? Their system, of course, does not, but the small farmer says he could manage very well. What greater question can there be before us than this one of the land, when so many interests have their origin directly or indirectly in it? It must not be imagined for an instant that those who have no direct interest in it are not concerned. The contrary is the case. The pressure arising from an excess of population in the towns, and the outcry for the adoption of Neo-Malthusianism, have their origin there. "A better country means a better town." (See Dr. Cox on country life in *Lent in London*, 1895.) Any nation that is divorced from the soil, as the English nation is now very rapidly becoming, driven as it is into the stifling atmosphere of dreary and unwholesome cities and towns, can never be a vigorous one. "To anyone who has compared the physique of militia and volunteer battalions recruited in the country with the like recruited in the town, this will be painfully suggestive for the future of the people of England." (Longstaffe.)

"The loss of pure air, sunshine, and other 'free' goods, and its effect on the physique of city dwellers, is not adequately compensated by hygienic reforms of town life itself, while the increased number and complexity of sensations impose a greater strain upon the nervous system. The nervous degeneration which thus accrues may perhaps be checked in time by further hygienic improvement of the town, and by a gradual readjustment between the nervous system and its changed environment. But meantime grave physical injuries arise directly from those very economic changes which have raised the economic condition of the great mass of the workers, and

have probably reduced the quantity of purely economic poverty. When we reflect that the physical injuries of town life, attested by rates of mortality and impaired muscular activity, fall most heavily upon the poor, we shall see grave reason to doubt whether the modern conditions of industrial and social life are generally favourable to the physical vitality of the low-paid worker or the 'residuum,' that is to say, whether he gets any net vital advantage out of the higher rate of real wages which he obtains when he is working. When we also bear in mind that each year a higher proportion of the workers are living in large towns, where the duration of life is about 15 per cent. less than in the country, and that the age of enforced retirement from regular wage-earning is, by reason of the strain of competition and the regulations of trade organizations, considerably earlier than it was formerly, and that an increased irregularity of employment is discernible in many or most trades, we may hold it doubtful whether the average worker of the lower order makes a total life-wage which is any higher than he made formerly. The conclusion applied by Mr. Charles Booth to the whole body of workers, that 'in one way or another effective working-life is ten years longer in the country than in the town,' has an important significance, when we remember that each decennial census shows a growing proportion of workers subject to the conditions of town life." (Hobson.)

Nobody can help observing that in consequence of the son of the soil being unable, owing to adverse conditions, to obtain any part of the soil to cultivate, he is really driven into the town to seek a livelihood there. This rural exodus leaves the country untilled, the village without life and depopulated, except by the aged and those more or less helpless—those who cannot by any means escape from it. Is this natural, is it as it should be for the welfare of the nation? The consequence, of course, is that the unnatural life of the town is increased, the natural one of the country decreased. "We can see what the growth of town population and the decay of the country one really means. It means that, in the first place, each year brings a larger proportion of the nation within reach of the higher rate of mortality, by taking them from more healthy and placing them under less healthy conditions, where the chance of death in a given year is doubled to them." In 1851 there were 1,253,000 agricultural labourers; in 1891

that number had fallen to 780,000, a reduction in forty years of no less than 473,000. Between 1881 and 1891 74,000 had left the country for the town.

The following figures are of interest :—

	1861.	1871.	1881.	1891.
Urban population .	62·3 ...	64·8 ...	66·6 ...	71·7
Rural „ .	37·7 ...	35·2 ...	33·4 ...	28·3

In 1891 the case in England alone was :—

Urban population	20,802,773
Rural „	8,198,248

“Permanent pasture—food for horses, cows, and sheep—is being laid down at the rate of 100,000 acres per annum. Already 16,000,000 arable acres have so been disposed of, and as horses, cows, and sheep have come, the tillers of English soil have gone. There are in England and Wales over 13,000 rural parishes; and to such a deplorable extent has the cold-blooded work of depopulation been carried, that 6000 of these now have less than 300 inhabitants each.” (Davidson). At the present time it is computed that there is but one labourer, on an average, to 180 acres of land; formerly, not so long ago, the average was ten or twelve. The agricultural labourer has ceased to care for anything in connection with the land; he has become a mere machine for others, he has lost all interest in the soil; it does not matter to him whether it produces abundantly or the opposite, which ever it does brings him no good; he is in the country, yet he is not of the country; as long as he can, by hook or by crook, get his miserable pittance of twelve shillings a week, he is obliged to be content.

So far for the head, the father of a family. But education has changed the son; he sees no hope in the country; he pities his unfortunate sire. Naturally he thinks that connection with the failing land has brought him to the pitiable condition in which he sees him; he flees from the country, and seeks his fortune in the city. Mr. Hobson shows us how all the men required for great physical labour in London are drawn from the country; for instance, in the year 1888 the London Police afforded the following statistics :—

	LONDON-BORN.	COUNTRY-BORN.
Metropolitan Police .	2716 ...	10,908
City Police .	194 ...	698

He says a pure Londoner of the third generation is seldom found, the vital stamina has decreased so rapidly. "The want of air and light, of peaceful repose out of doors for all ages, and of healthy play for children, exhausts the energies of the best blood of England, which is constantly flowing towards our large towns. These absorb all the best blood from the rest of England; the most enterprising, the most highly-gifted, those with the highest physical power and the strongest character, go there to find scope for their abilities. But by the time their children and their children's children have grown up without any healthy play, and without fresh air, there is often little trace of their original vigour."

Professor Marshall says that three generations of city life practically works a family out. In the well-to-do classes we find that the young men and women are physically better developed than they were in the last generation, but precisely the opposite is the case with a large proportion of the working-classes in cities to-day. The strength and health of the great bulk of the producing classes are being practically rotted out of them. All this is exceedingly serious, and the more so inasmuch as soon there will be no agricultural population to draw upon, the recruiting-ground for the fires of Moloch in the cities will be no longer available. Unless a radical change in the conditions of labour shortly takes place, the population of England will wofully deteriorate.

As long as we persist in maintaining absurd modes of tenure of land and its cultivation, as long as we pursue the disastrous course of preventing the labourer from having free access to the land, we are increasing the suffering population of the fetid alley; we are, in a word, doing all we can to cause a too-abundant birth-rate, without any check or limit. It is notorious that the atmosphere, surroundings, and temptations of the town and factory enormously contribute to sexual excitement, and, consequently, to increase of population. The present miserable modes of dealing with land matters are creating a class which we bid have no hope of raising itself, no hope of any improvement, buried, as it is, in the many degrading influences of the city. We are driving out the hind, the son of the soil, the ruddy peasant, who was once the pride of England, the glory of our race, not to be found elsewhere in the whole world—the fair-haired, the blue-eyed Anglo-Saxon, from which the American prides himself he

sprang--out of the country into the devastating town, to moan away his life, to perish in his prime, to fill the urban cemetery, to die before he has reached thirty ; we are converting a healthy population from the country into a stricken and diseased one in the town. If all hope of raising or improving itself is removed from mankind, it invariably gives itself up to the lowest sensual pleasures only. Loria very forcibly says : "As the process of redistribution, made necessary by the cessation of the freedom of land, has for its last result an excessive capital which injures production, and is disastrously spent in speculation and crisis, so the process of population, equally produced by the same cause, has for its last result an excessive population, which becomes lost in the voiceless ruins of poverty and degeneration." He also says that when the earth ceases to be free, the new members of the population depend for their subsistence upon the goodwill of the capitalist class, that is to say, upon the increase of profit, which it consents to distribute under the form of food among the other class. The cessation of the freedom of land begets, by means of wages, an economic limitation of country production, and also, by means of salary and its oscillations, an economic stimulus to human generation ; thus it necessarily affects poverty and the excess of population. Populations in which all things tend to degrade invariably are influenced by their surroundings, and give themselves up to all that is sensual and forbidding. Where there is material comfort, where there are mental and moral influences at work, these are necessarily restrained, sexual control is acquired, and such cases as fourteen or more children are unheard of. "Everything," says Laveleye, "is summed up in the question whether discomfort or ease lead to an increase of population." Loria says again : "The fact is, that the worker of to-day is led by two motives to an improvident fecundity. On the one hand, he very soon arrives at the apex of his career, at the ultimate limit of his aspirations, hence every effort of ulterior improvement, and, indeed, every idea of foresight, is completely cast aside ; while, on the other hand, the possibility of employing children in factories leads to the idea of increasing the income of his family by increasing the number of his children." Montesquieu said : "Those who, like beggars, have absolutely nothing, have many children. It costs the father nothing to teach his trade to his children, and they, being born, are even the instruments

of his trade. Such people increase because they do not bear the burden of society, but they are themselves the burden of society." "The beggar has many children because he cares little about their fate. They can always be beggars as their fathers were before them." (Yves Guyot.) It would be well for those who are interested in this matter to study all that Nitti writes on this point. He says the lower the economic situation and the moral feelings of the general population are, the more restricted are their pleasures to those of sense, so much the more is their birth-rate abundant and disordered. But, on the other hand, every improvement of the general condition, every diffusion of wealth, every increase of wages and of the standard of living, exercise a useful influence on their birth-rate. He says that a great birth-rate always answers to a great depression of the working-classes, to smallness of wages, to a bad distribution of wealth, to an absence of social capillarity. The countries where public wealth is most largely divided, such as France, Switzerland, and Belgium, are those where the birth-rate is least; while, on the other hand, Russia, Servia, Hungary, and Germany, that is, where the distribution is worst, are those which have the largest birth-rate. As the peasant gradually sinks to the condition of a mere wage-earner, he loses that prudent foresight which the mediæval farmers maintained for centuries, and generates recklessly, impelled by the need of supplementing his own insufficient wages by those of his children. All history assures us of the truth that when men had free access to the land, and held it in possession, the birth-rate was less than it is now. It is the same with regard to all wealth; remove the possibility of acquiring any from human nature, and the intoxication of the senses alone remains for it to indulge in, and it certainly does. We have only to study foreign writings on this point very carefully to observe how they all agree on this point. Foreigners have written upon it much more than we have—Virchow, Courcelle-Seneuil, Passy, Cheysson, Quetelet, Schwabe, Villermé, and Chateauneux; of our own writers see Adam Smith, Marton, Wallace, Farr, and Jefferies. Again, Nitti says that all this excessive generation in a hopeless class is not only evident from an economic and statistical standpoint, but also from a psychological point of view. If a man falls into poverty, and is hindered from every participation in the superior benefits of civilization, it will be seen that he will find no other pleasures

than those of the senses. Such has been the rule at all times and in all countries. The argument of the heedless and desperate class can be aptly summed up in Dr. Johnson's famous saying, "A man is poor, he thinks he cannot be worse, so I'll take Peggy." (See also what Doubleday and Thornton say on this point.) Virchow asked a very poor working-man of Berlin why he had begotten so many children. He replied, with a smile, "This is the only pleasure left us." We have also Richard Jefferies' testimony corroborating all this. "He minded when that sharp old Miss — was always coming round with tracts and blankets like taking some straw to a lot of pigs, and lecturing his missus about economy. What a fuss she made, and scolded his wife as if she was a thief for having that fifteenth boy! His missus turned on her at last, and said, 'Lor, Miss, that's all the pleasure me and my ole man have got.'" The agricultural labourer of the present day very plainly sees under the prevailing adverse economic conditions the utter impossibility of a provident life, and so becomes quite regardless of all issues. Give him some land of his own to deal with, and the man changes at once. He instantly appreciates the great economic advantage of marrying at thirty instead of twenty. Everybody who has ever inquired into the matter assures us that whenever people become possessed of land, marriages become less reckless and improvident. Guillard tells us that when the condition of the serfs improved and their comforts increased, when they became real land-owners, they had a very weak birth-rate, although nothing whatever immoral was done. It arose, of course, from prudent marriages.

"Every diffusion of wealth and every increase of solidarity imply a development of individuality. Every development of individuality implies a decrease of fecundity." (Nitti.) It will be well for all those who have the best interests of the nation at heart to bear in mind all the evils, both economic and moral, which the rural exodus means. Everywhere the number of peasants is diminishing, that of the wage-earners in the unhealthy factory is increasing. Wherever we look, into whatever agricultural system of any country we examine, we invariably find that where the population has sufficient of the soil to own and cultivate, it is contented to remain connected with it, and does not seek expulsion from it. No matter what country—Jersey, Ireland, England, or any part of

Europe—wherever the peasant is an owner, or tenant on proper terms, his condition becomes more hopeful, and the birth-rate decreases. Reasons for thrift, suitable marriage, immediately take possession of his mind, and the impulses of the senses are restrained. He has gained something to live for, something to hope for; the mere gratification of the moment is despised for the higher call of duty and self-respect.

Back to the land, out of which there is still a good living to be got, where health is to be found, where life is more innocent, simpler, more wholesome, out of the city, out of its crowded streets and vicious life, would not this be a better work for the Neo-Malthusian to take in hand than to advocate his own crude and exploded idea that poverty must always be caused by a teeming population? This question of the depopulation of the country, and the consequent intense pressure in the towns, is a terrible one, much more concerned with the welfare of every individual than is generally believed or recognized, not merely in the economic side, but in the more important ones, namely, the health, the vigour, and morality of the race. How can anybody suppose that a healthy race can be produced in the fetid atmospheres of our large cities? It is in the cities that the greatest increase of population is taking place, and it must be patent to all that it is an inferior and less vigorous one than which the country could produce. "The persistent breeding of the diseased semi-pauper will never swell emigration lists. Nor is our colonial empire one whit the fuller, nor our kingdom the stronger, for the tens of thousands of under-sized and narrow-witted children who are everywhere being added to our population by town-bred, poverty-stricken parents." (H. C., in *Daily Graphic*.)

It is indeed lamentable to look on both sides of the picture to-day. On the one side, to see the stricken country, upon which the discontented and disgusted peasant has turned his back with no regrets, and, on the other, the overcrowded and unhealthy streets and alleys of our cities; all this caused by the miserable, faulty systems of dealing with the land now rampant. The city life of the poor is well described by Froude: "An England of brick lanes and chimneys; an England sounding with the roar of engines and the tinkle of the factory bell; with artificial recreation grounds, and a rare holiday in what remained of wood and meadow for those

who without it would never see a wild flower blooming or look on an unpolluted river ; where children could not learn to play save in alley or asphalted court ; where the whole of the life of the immense majority of its inhabitants, from infancy to the grave, would be a dreary routine of soulless, mechanical labour—such an England as this would not be described by any future poet as

“ ‘ A precious gem set in the silver sea.’ ”

Still less would the race hereafter to grow there maintain either the strength of limb or the energy of heart which raised their fathers to the lofty eminence which they achieved and bequeathed. It is simply impossible that the English men and women of the future generations can equal or approach the famous race that has overspread the globe if they are to be bred in towns such as Birmingham and Glasgow now are, and to rear their families under the conditions which now prevail in those places ; morally and physically they must and will decline. Even the work so much boasted of is degrading on the terms on which it is carried on. What kind of nation will that be which has constituted its entire people into the mechanical drudges of the happier part of mankind, forced by the whip of hunger to be eternally manufacturing shirts and coats which others are to wear, and tools and engines which others are to use ? This is no life for beings with human souls in them. You may call such a nation free. It would be a nation of voluntary bondsmen in a service from which hope is shut out. Neither the toilers who submit to such a destiny while a better prospect is open, nor the employers who grow rich upon their labour, can ever rise to greatness, or preserve a greatness which they have inherited. Fine men and women are not to be reared in towns, among taverns and theatres and idle clatter of politics. They are nature's choicest creations, and can only be produced on nature's own conditions—under the free air of heaven, on the green earth, amidst woods and waters, and in the wholesome occupation of cultivating the soil.”

No matter whether in animal or vegetable life, we find that overcrowding is ruinously destructive to their health and best interests. It is somewhat curious to observe that the rate of stillborn children is much higher in the town than in the country. The following countries where these rates are taken give the following results per 1000 births :—

				TOWN.		COUNTRY.
Italy	.	.	.	31	...	22
Sweden	.	.	.	41	...	31
Prussia	.	.	.	45	...	40
France	.	.	.	53	...	39
Belgium	.	.	.	50	...	41
Holland	.	.	.	54	...	51

Taking only one parish in London, we can gain some idea what overcrowding means. The length of St. Augustine's, Stepney, can be walked in four minutes, its breadth in two minutes, yet within this confined space 7500 people live! In other countries there is the same overcrowding taking place in the towns, and just the same exodus from the country to the town. "In modern France, and especially in the cities and large towns which are continually drawing to themselves the youth and vigour of country districts, the aggregate of human beings no longer reproduces by births the yearly losses by death." (Dewey.)

French physicians have begun to write very vigorously against the habit of all classes concentrating in Paris and large cities. Brouardel writes: "The inhabitants of a large town, even the richest, who are surrounded by the greatest luxury, are continually being exposed to unfavourable influences, which diminishes their vital powers far more than what is inevitable. They breathe an atmosphere charged with organic detritus, they are in a state of continual nervous excitement, and we can compare them, without exaggeration, to the inhabitants of a marshy district. The effect of a large town on the human organism offers the closest analogy to that of the Maremma, and its population falls victim to the same fatality of degeneracy and destruction as the victims of malaria. The death-rate in a large town is more than a quarter greater than the average for the entire population; it is double that of the open country, though in reality it ought to be less, since in a large town the most vigorous ages predominate, during which the mortality is lower than in infancy and old age.

The children of large towns who are not carried off at an early age suffer from the peculiar arrested development which Morel has ascertained in the population of fever districts. They develop more or less normally until fourteen or fifteen years of age, and are up to that time alert, sometimes brilliantly endowed, and give the highest promise; then suddenly there

is a standstill, the mind loses its facility of comprehension, and the boy who only yesterday was a model scholar becomes an obtuse, clumsy dunce, who can only be steered with the greatest difficulty through his examinations. With these mental changes bodily modifications go hand-in-hand. The growth of the long bones is extremely slow or ceases entirely, the legs remain short, the pelvis retains a feminine form, certain other organs cease to develop, and the entire being presents a strange and repulsive mixture of incompleteness and decay." We also read in the French returns that the general mortality throughout France was, from 1886 to 1890, 22·21 per 1000. But in Paris it rose to 23·4; in Marseilles to 34·8; in all towns with more than 100,000 inhabitants to a mean of 28·31; in all places where there were less than 5000 inhabitants to 21·74.

It is within the power and possibility of a great number of people, although not directly connected with the land, to improve the conditions under which so many of the poor are now obliged to live, and mitigate the necessities which have caused the rural exodus. Owing to that unfortunate craving for exciting pleasures which is so characteristic of English society now, many families leave England and live on the Continent, where these doubtful pleasures are to be had in profusion. But such people should ask themselves, Is it fair to spend the money which English sweat and blood has provided for them amongst aliens, to the detriment of their own people and country? How many rich but idle families there are who prefer to bask in the sunshine of the south of France and Italy during the winter, and to wander aimlessly over the Continent in the summer, than to remain in their own country and do something to help their poor, suffering fellow-creatures. It seems extraordinary that, notwithstanding all the agricultural depression which is now taking place, notwithstanding the exodus from the country to the unhealthy town, English people should be so indifferent, so callous, to the sufferings of their fellow-countrymen as to prefer to spend the money which they have gained from their hard and unjust labour in foreign countries. Would it not be more patriotic, more charitable, more considerate for such people to return to or continue to live in the country parts of England, where their presence is so sorely needed, than to drawl out their lives and spend their money in miserable foreign places of

amusement? Do these people imagine how much they could contribute towards making English country life brighter and happier, as it used to be, than it is now? Upon the slightest excuse, when English people are now ordered to seek a holiday, their first thought is to go abroad; but if they would but think for a moment, they would at once realize that this course of action is not fair to their own nation. The time has come when everything which tends to the welfare of one's fellow-creatures or the contrary, no matter how seemingly insignificant it may appear, must be considered. Christian feeling for the poor has become stronger, and it condemns those who contemptuously turn away on the other side, and show by their inconsiderate actions that they care nothing for suffering humanity, especially when that is at their own doors. Public opinion is fast condemning that unfair economical course which induces English people to voluntarily turn their backs upon rural life at home and spend English money abroad, thereby benefiting others instead of their own kin, who are perishing in the fetid cities of England.

Those landowners who go abroad for the winter should consider how much better it would be for the land they own, for the peasants who live upon it, if they spent the money which they spend upon foreign hotels on the cottages of the poor at home, thus rendering them fitter for healthy dwelling-places for their fellow-Christians to live in. Squalid cottages which the tenant for life is, in too many instances, unable, owing to the necessity of providing for his own flesh and blood, and which he cannot sell, to render fit for human habitation. Wretched cottagers and cottages which the landlord turns his back carelessly upon, while he seeks health and happiness for himself and his elsewhere, regardless of what those who are dependent upon him suffer.

“ Parson do preach and tell us to pray,
And to think of our work, and ask no more pay;
And to follow the ploughshare, and never think
Of crazy cottage and ditch-stuff stink,
That doctor do say breeds ager and chills,
Or, worse, the fever that kills;
And a' bids me pay my way like a man,
Whether I can't or whether I can;
And as I hain't beef to be thankful for bread,
And bless the Lord it tain't turmit instead;
And never envy the farmer's pig,
For all a' lies warm and is fed to big,

While the missus and little ones grow that thin,
 You may count their bones underneath their skin.
 I'm to call all I gits the chast'ning rod,
 And look up to my betters, and then thank God ! "

This is the picture which the English peasant now draws of himself, his life, and his career, and it is a very sad one. Do English people, again, ever consider how much they increase the misery of the town and the wretchedness of the village by they themselves departing from country life and crowding into the West End of London? If they would but study the point, they would see how much healthier they would be, how much longer they would live, how much better it would be for everybody, if they remained at the manor-house, or in the country, enjoying their simpler but yet healthier pleasures, than the more vivacious, but yet more vicious ones of the town. If they would only desist from leaving the country for London they would confer many blessings upon peasant life, not least in setting an example to the rustic, who naturally, seeing the well-to-do depart from the country, does precisely the same himself. How many men there are living idle, discontented lives, yet with every luxury in London, who would do enormous good to themselves and England if they sought occupation in the country. Do these men ever consider how much they could contribute to their own happiness and to that of others if they found some work to do in the country? how much brighter life they might introduce into the village, how much more hope for agriculture, if they left the selfish pleasures and luxuries of the club for the country? Their lives would then be very much more useful spent in activity, than dragged out in the armchair of the club, and consequently much happier. Above all, how much they could contribute towards making English country life a little more "merrie" than it is at present. What a much greater amount of interest they could cause to arise in country and local matters if they transferred themselves from the enforced idleness of the town to the greater activity of country life. "The heavens above, or the earth beneath, or the waters under the earth, do not contain anything more monstrous than an idle man." Yet how many hundreds of thousands of these are living useless lives in London and health resorts. Life insurance statistics tell us that of all classes the idle one has the greatest mortality. Yet what innumerable works there are in the country waiting

to be taken up. In these days of impossibility to obtain investments for money, how many sources of profit and pleasure await tapping in the country. In these days of agricultural depression many people who would like to farm are obliged to leave it alone, consequently the old English gentleman-farmer is fast disappearing. But there is a modern industry which is fast spreading, and which can be made to some extent a substitute for the older pursuit, namely, fruit-farming; for it supplies a real want, that is to say, something which can occupy a man's time and keep him contented in his country life.

"O Fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, Agricolas."

During the last few years glass-farming in England is increasing very much. By it country life is made pleasant as well as remunerative, and it is a wonder that more people do not enter into these undertakings, where ideals seem so well within grasp; for when the day's work is over there is leisure for music, art, or literature, or for paying attention to some hobby or for indulging in the sports and pastimes of the country, and even, should one not be an imitator of Marius or Virgil—

"At secure quies et nescis fallere Vita."

Furthermore, hours are not binding, and an occasional holiday can be taken. A capital of £2000 invested in a little property and glass-houses would not leave so large a gap even in a small income; and yet upon that twenty or twenty-five per cent. profit can easily be made, that is to say, from £400 to £500 a year. It is possible to make even thirty per cent. or more on the actual money expended upon the glass; surely a good enough return in these days of two per cents. Grapes, tomatoes, cucumbers, mushrooms, wall-fruits, and flowers of all sorts pay very well. The people who judiciously lay out a couple of thousand pounds for this sort of culture recoup themselves remarkably well, can make a good income, have an interesting occupation, further their hobbies, and indulge in all country sports and amusement, at the same time helping others to lead happier lives. How much better such occupations, such lives, would be than the unhealthy ones of the clubs and towns. One of the great attractions of glass-farming is that ladies can work at it without any inconvenience.

In this way many women could find work suitable for them, much more so than in the factory.

What manifold opportunities there are for those who are at present living idle lives in health resorts to organize and inaugurate rural industries such as those at Compton Greenfield and Keswick, and which confer so much local benefit on country life, the villagers, and the village. People ought to realize how much cheaper they can live in the country than in the town ; how much more material prosperity they could bring back to the country if they would but cease to live in the town ; above all, how much misery they could remove from the overcrowded cities. How thankful the isolated clergy and villagers would be for a revival of English country life, for a little more society, for a little more self-sacrifice by Christian people for the Christian poor. How much happiness might be brought into each home ; how much brighter the long winter evenings in the country might be. As surely as the country-side is kept at its deadly dullness for the labouring man on a winter's evening, so surely will the pith and marrow of our English rural life find its way up to the bewildering cities, and lose itself, its simplicity, its freshness, its very life, in the flare and glare of our monster towns.

If wealthy men would but consider how many are drawn from the country to minister to their families in the town or city, they would at once see the harm they are doing all round. It is computed that each family spending a thousand a year has no less than seventy people working in some way or other for them, more or less. Now, taking this into consideration, it may well become a matter for serious thought how many people are dragged out of the healthy country to minister to the wealthy families of the West End. "It may by-and-bye be perceived that equity utters dictates to which we have not yet listened ; and men may then learn that to deprive others of their rights to the use of the earth is to commit a crime inferior only in wickedness to the crime of taking away their lives or personal liberties." (Spencer.)

If the well-to-do classes will only relinquish the fatal habit, so prevalent now, of rushing abroad, and to London and elsewhere, out of the country, and set an example of living in it, and expending their money, their energies, and their charity in it, much to relieve present want, much to relieve an excessive population, much to restrain immoralities would be accom-

plished. It is sometimes curious to hear those wealthy people who leave the country voluntarily, regretting and bewailing the depopulation of the villages and the pressure in the towns, yet forgetting all the time that they are contributing more to all this than anybody else. They do not seem capable of understanding that a better country is a better town. Another serious factor in augmenting the decay of country life and labour arises from the fact that many companies, corporations, cathedral establishments, colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, and charitable institutions, derive a very considerable portion of their revenues from English land; yet in consequence of their trusts they are unable, however willing, to return a just proportion to the lands from which they come. It might be supposed that the revenues from those who pay for their education at colleges should be sufficient to support those institutions; but it is not so, they have to rely very much on the produce of the lands they own. It should be remembered that when these grants were made, and such trusts created, the land of England was in a very different situation to what it is at present, and more allowance should be made for the difference. The modern problems which have arisen since that day require a much more serious consideration than that which has been vouchsafed to them.

When we realize the fact that the exodus from the country to the town means an increased natality, and not only that, but the excess of population which is thereby augmented is merely a multiplication of the unfit, we can see what harm the exodus is doing in all directions. For instance, the birth-rate in the mining towns of Durham amounted in 1891 to 38·2 per 1000, but in none of the purely agricultural counties did it exceed 27·5. Another proof of how the country populations are being transferred into the towns can be seen from the following figures:—

In England and Wales, during the year 1891, 71·7 per cent. of the population lived in urban sanitary districts; these had increased since 1881 only by 15·3 per cent., but during the same period of ten years the rural sanitary districts had only increased 3·4 per cent. In some counties there has been an actual depopulation. Cornwall, since 1861, has lost 46,801 of its inhabitants; Hereford, since 1871, 9571; Huntingdon, since 1861, 6478; Rutland, since 1851, 2536; and Shropshire, since 1871, 11,795. Mr. Hobson says that in the period

1881-1891 no fewer than twelve English and eight Welsh counties show a decrease of rural inhabitants, taking the higher limit of urban population. In 1861 37·7 per cent. of the population were living in the country; in 1891 the proportion had sunk to 28·3 per cent.

We need not consider any further the fact of the rural exodus; it is patent to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear, and has been treated of by writers who have made it a special study. My point is merely to note how it tends to increase population by bringing it under temptations and conditions productive of sexual excitement in the cities and towns which it would not be under the more natural and simpler life of the country. The streets, the glare of the lamps, the music halls, the theatres, the increased mingling of the sexes, whatever amusement is provided by the city, all tend to increase sexual desire, and consequently immature marriages with all their results. Even if all these excitements to sexual passion existed in the country, the evils would not be so bad as in the town; for even if the excess of population which is now occurring in the towns were to take place in the country, still it would be a healthy one, physically able to make its way under stress of circumstances. No matter what multiplication might take place in the country, it never could be considered to be a multiplication of the unfit. Without going into the matter any further, the condition of the country child and the town one is quite sufficiently palpable to all to prove this. Education is also playing a part in the depopulation of the rural districts. There are many who think that it plays a very great part. They say that its tendency is to disfigure the farm servant for servitude, the agricultural labourer for his work and station, for anything of rural work. A good deal of evidence seems rising up to corroborate this belief. Many teachers in country schools tell us that education undoubtedly has the effect of making lads dissatisfied with country life and work. If this is the case, the good effected by education will have to be considerably qualified, for many tell us it causes country lads to yearn for the clerk-life of the town, in preference to that of the ploughman. Education, we may well believe, has a tendency to cause the country-bred boy to despise the humble but necessary work of digging, thatching, hedging, and ditching. In fact, many reports from the country tell

us that as the old men are dying off there is nobody left to take their places in doing these things. On the other hand, if the education given in all schools had for its object increased interest to arise in country life and production, this evil could be easily remedied. If given in town schools, it would cause a desire to live in the country; if given in the country, it would create a satisfaction in remaining there. The idea of causing a national pride to arise by the use of flags, etc., in schools, which has lately been advanced, is no doubt an excellent one, but a still better one would be to do something towards causing a renewed interest to arise in country life and work.

With regard to the question of the most suitable size of farms for the newly-created class of tenant labourers to have, no one single rule can be laid down. Circumstances and the counties of England change very much. Where there is much pasture, a fifty-acre farm would be none too large for one family to undertake. It is when the question of arable farms arises that difficulties enter in. It is obvious that in a dairy farm of, say, fifty acres, there would be very much less manual labour required than on an arable one. All that would be needed as broken surface in such a farm would be sufficient to maintain the family and provide suitable food, such as roots, comfrey, etc., for the cows. To cultivate such a farm would be well within the powers of a family, or two families combined. One of the most profitable returns still happily left to the British farmer is the sale of milk. He, generally speaking, contracts with a milk merchant in the nearest town or city to supply him with all the milk he can produce, and so arises the frequent complaint amongst the country districts now that the labourer cannot get any milk at all for himself or his children. Very often the clergyman of the parish has to keep cows merely to supply those who need it most, but who cannot obtain it from the farmer. Under the system of small farms this difficulty would cease.

When we come to enter into the question of arable farms, many difficulties beset us. The chief object of research is what is the amount of average productive land which a labourer can undertake with profit. The experiment has been tried over and over again with as yet not a completely satisfactory result. In many cases men who have undertaken such farms without some kind of external help have failed. Lord Wantage's experiment at

Lambourne is being watched with a considerable degree of interest as to what the result will be. At Minster Lovel, in Oxfordshire, Fergus O'Connor's scheme on these lines miserably failed; but that was chiefly owing, so I am assured by the present proprietors, in consequence of the first owners being people from the towns, who knew nothing whatever of agricultural work. They very soon gave up, and the plots of ground passed into the hands of others, who seem to have succeeded fairly well. At the present time the farmers who are cultivating these small farms tell me that, without doing anything very extraordinary in the acquisition of wealth, they have nothing to complain of. Their produce is varied. One thing which I noticed very plainly in going through this district was that the proprietors of these small farms lived on the produce, and had a considerable amount of overplus to exchange for their needs. None were poor, yet none could say they were making a fortune; but all were contented, which was certainly not the case with others who were tenants of large farms not far off. When a family consists of man and wife and small children only, of course he could not undertake so large a piece of ground as if he had stalwart lads to aid him in its cultivation; but when these were present in the family it would not be impossible for the man to undertake an arable farm of twelve to fifteen acres, and yet be under no necessity to engage external labour. It is the wage-bill, the cost of keeping the horse, as the large farmer knows very well, which consume all the profits on a farm, no matter how small. When these are not undergone the profits are much more tangible and remunerative. It is the initial cost of the horse and cart, and the loss sometimes incurred by death, which curtails the profits of the small farmer so much. Generally speaking, where many of these small farms exist there is somebody who hires out a horse or horses, and so this difficulty is overcome. I noticed that this was the case at Minster Lovel. It seemed to answer remarkably well. Of course, the aspect of the matter varies very much upon the distance from a market town and railway communication. Where these are available, it is much more possible for a man and his family to deal with more land than if he was at disadvantages concerning them. His small farm would be in that case more of the nature of a market garden than a mere arable one. Many comparisons have been made between the systems of large

farms in England and the small culture of France ; but here, again, the opinions of those most competent to judge are very conflicting. Some say that in France the tendency is for small holdings to increase into large ones ; others, that it is not so. All, however, agree in stating that the small farmer there, or rather proprietor, only exists by the exercise of the strictest economy and thrift. It is said that they practise these so very extensively that no Englishman would be found to do the same. But the reason the Frenchman does it is to maintain his independence, a word dear to the hearts of all men. If Englishmen had the same hope in view they would most certainly do the same. The class out of which the tenants or proprietors of these proposed small farms would arise has never yet had the chance of testing the matter. If the opinions expressed by the better class of agricultural labourers be worth anything, they all unite in affording us the strongest and weightiest evidence that a most complete revolution in the production of English land would ensue, as well as a very great improvement in the financial condition of the class which all ought to desire should remain in the country. The question of diminishing returns, or the impossibility of land returning the value of its cultivation and expense, is one which requires a great deal of qualification. Mr. Lawe's experiments at Rothamstead have demonstrated how land can be made to produce wheat year after year for many years, and that the value of the crop increases instead of decreases. Moreover, the question would not be likely to arise for a very long time. Immense areas of English land are now not producing anything like what they could do under better cultivation. Much has been left to become mere prairie land. The landowner of the present day has very serious responsibilities cast upon him. He must realize, the sooner the better, that the manner in which he deals with his land affects the whole community, rich and poor, to a most alarming degree. If he continues to present impossibilities and obstacles in the way of a very deserving and thoroughly capable class from obtaining some land to deal with, he should understand that he is increasing the mortality and miseries of his fellow-creatures. This is a point of view which the landowner should carefully study. He would be compelling the agricultural labourer to transform himself into the wage competitor of the town. But yet, no matter how eager he might be to give facilities to the

labourer to become a tenant or proprietor of a small farm, he is confronted with the same difficulty which clogs the path of the aspiring labourer, namely, the want of capital by the latter. Here it is where the State or a syndicate of wealthy philanthropists could effect so much. Surely it would be better for both of these to prevent the necessity for the exercise of a doubtful charity, or that of dealing with a congested pauperism in workhouses throughout the cities and towns, by advancing financial help to those who would profit by it in the country.

The manner in which the funds of the Disestablished Church in Ireland have been utilized, and the extraordinary integrity by which the interest on the advances and the principal itself have been repaid by the hitherto supposed thriftless Irish tenant, is a very remarkable proof that the saving English labourer would be no whit behind the Irishman in doing likewise. Fully recognizing the necessity there is for labour in commercial and trade centres, such as cities and towns, yet there is ample room for a diminution of that labour. It has become a serious overplus, and hence most of the suffering and misery of the towns and cities. Here the Neo-Malthusian finds a wide and expectant field for his evil teaching, here it is where it is mostly preached, and now beginning to be extensively practised. When the conditions of labour in the towns become more suitable to the lawful and just demands of humanity, when the rural exodus is made to cease, when the natural demands of the agricultural labourer are conceded, then we have certain grounds for believing that the moral condition of our working population will be improved, and the practice of Neo-Malthusianism die out.

EMIGRATION CONSIDERED AS A HELP TO REDUCE AN EXCESS OF POPULATION

ANOTHER very potent factor capable of bringing our population within due bounds, and consequently reducing competition and poverty, and also removing the so-called necessity for Neo-Malthusianism, would be a well-ordered system of emigration. This, to be of any real service in reducing excess of population, should not be left as it is now, in haphazard fashion, to individual tastes, necessities, whims, or capabilities. It should be undertaken by authority in a much more comprehensive and scientific manner than it is at the present time both by the exporting mother country and the importing colony.

The home life of England, with all its tender associations, which so many have been accustomed to and nurtured in, should not be ruthlessly broken up by one or two of its members being obliged to emigrate. There should be no such violent wrench, no necessity for so grievous a separation. It is this separation which brings about the great sting and the great preventative to emigration. Many a stalwart man with children says, "I want to go so much, but I cannot leave my old parents who are dependent upon me." Under a proper system of State-aided, general, not individual emigration, these hindrances would not arise, and in addition the colonist would not always have uppermost in his mind that thought and desire to return home to enjoy the home life of England with his relatives, from which he had been torn against his will in his younger days. Under a just and useful system of emigration there would be no breaking up of social or affectionate ties, as there is, alas! in far too many cases now, and which has a most disastrous effect upon the increase of emigration. It is only natural that there should be a great reluctance to sever home ties and relationships. If this difficulty were removed a great eager-

ness, not a strong disinclination to emigrate as we see now existing, would most certainly follow.

We have much to learn and profit by from the example of Greek colonization. Even so long ago as those days the question of undue severity in separating relatives was fully considered and remedied. The Greek system did not leave it to the individual to decide whether it was best or not for him to go; it deported the populations of whole districts and villages from Greece to the new country, and we know very well how the whole three—the mother country, the colony, and the deported population—prospered. Under the Greek system all that underwent the necessary change was the condition, not the family, that went on as before; husband and wife, brother and sister, were not separated as they are under our present pernicious individual system. The work of the Greek colonists continued just as it did in their own native valleys, all lived and worked together as they had previously done in their former homes. This it was which made the Greek system so wonderfully prosperous, and made the Greek so anxious to emigrate. Our system is the exact opposite to this, and does not succeed because the principle of human love and affection is ignored. I venture to say that if it was now rendered possible for whole families to leave England together for a colony, hundreds of thousands would most gladly go. We have some grounds for believing that such would be the case. Those who have studied the reports of the great and helpful work done by Mr. Tuke know very well how marvellously successful his scheme of assisting whole families to emigrate from the west of Ireland has been. This, too, in a peculiar district, and amongst the most sentimental nation in the world, where the love of the wretched cabin which is called home is more intense than anywhere else in the world. We know what great efforts were made by the people themselves to qualify for the emigration rules, and how touching were the instances in which persons and families helped one another to gain what all so eagerly desired. If anybody should question the truth of the statement that families taken together would gladly emigrate if they had the opportunity, then let him read the reports of Mr. Tuke's work in Ireland, and learn from them how gladly the boon offered to Irishmen was accepted. (See *Contemporary Review*, June, 1896.) It is the opposing influences necessarily existing between individual and social

emigration which make all the difference between successful emigration and the contrary. This is what Cardinal Manning wrote ten years ago on this subject: "I have come to the conclusion that the emigration of people one by one is a feeble way of doing the work, which requires energetic action at the present day. I support the view that the right way of colonization is by sending out a population to form the nucleus of new settlements in various parts of the empire. The efforts of individuals and of societies are unequal to this task, and I therefore hold that the State should aid the aims of those who would relieve the mother country of the evils of overcrowding in the great cities here." This plan of deporting populations of an entire district is the only one which can possibly relieve our present pressure of population so far as emigration is concerned.

Individual emigration, supported by philanthropists or societies, merely touches but the very fringe of the great question, and has no real effect in reducing population. Besides, it is productive of much sorrow and regret in the mind of the individual emigrant at having to leave his home and relatives, instead of what there should be on departure—hope and courage. It is a grievous injustice to those who are leaving, and who by doing so diminish the pressure at home, that they should leave under melancholy instead of joyful circumstances. The present system is ludicrously inadequate to reduce the present excess of population, moreover the number of emigrants is diminishing instead of increasing.

The figures are as follows :—

YEAR.					
1881	243,002
1882	279,366
1883	320,118
1884	242,179
1885	207,644
1886	232,900
1887	281,487
1888	279,928
1889	253,795
1890	218,116
1891	218,507
1892	210,042
1893	208,814
1894	156,030
1895	185,181

It is somewhat curious that at the very time when population is enormously increasing at home, causing all manner of trouble, emigration, which should be the great outlet for it, is decreasing. It seems contrary to what one might naturally expect. With regard to the whole question of emigration, and the beneficial results which would accrue from a proper system being adopted, we may be well satisfied that the aim which we, as well as the Neo-Malthusians, have, namely, to avoid the results which flow in upon us from an excess of population, can be better attained by dispersing than by artificially limiting it. The proof of the wisdom of the former is displayed by France, which has adopted the latter to her decay and confusion.

The time has come when England will have to adopt some wiser schemes of emigration than she does now. Even when *Oceana* was written, the relief was obvious which emigration could afford, and yet no improvement has been effected since that time. Froude wrote then: "These islands cannot bear a larger population than they have at present without peril to soul and body. It appears as if the genius of England, anticipating the inevitable increase, had provided beforehand for the distribution of it. English enterprise has occupied the fairest spots upon the earth, where there is still air and sunshine boundless and life-giving; where the race might for ages renew its mighty youth, bring forth as many millions as it would, and would still have means to breed and rear them, strong as the best which she had produced in her early prime. England could pour out among them year after year those poor children of hers now choking in fetid alleys, and, relieved of the strain, breathe again fresh air into her own smoke-encrusted lungs. Some years ago a Colonial Premier spoke to me on this subject. I said that thousands of boys and girls would now annually be leaving our board schools with a rudimentary education who had no parents, no friends, and no prospects. I asked him if his colony would take some of them, fetch them out, and apprentice them till they were twenty-one. He replied that nothing would be received more warmly and gratefully by the colony."

If the usual objection be made that the cost of State-aided emigration would be very great, surely the answer which at once arises in the mind is that it would be wiser policy to transfer some of the gigantic cost incurred by keeping paupers

at home who are unable to earn their living, to a better system, which would give them boundless opportunities to attain to prosperity. Surely it would be better for all to have shiploads of the young leaving our shores for new and happier homes in the colonies than to build workhouses and undergo enormous expense in maintaining armies of officials to guard them and their unfortunate inmates. If the nation would but consider the great advantages which would be derived all round, an emigration rate would be more acceptable to everybody than a poor one. The former would afford more satisfaction to those who had to pay it, inasmuch as it would be a sure means of helping others to a new career in life under fairer prospects of success, under better conditions than they could ever expect to attain to if obliged to remain in our crowded cities. In the colonies are boundless opportunities of improvement; the very air breathes freedom and expansion. At home we are circumscribed at every turn; opponents by the hundred meet us whenever we apply for a vacancy. There seems no hope, no possibility of improvement, surrounded as so many are now by circumstances which degrade instead of elevate. "How shall a child of the slums, ill-fed in body and mind, brought up in the industrial and moral degradation of low city life, without a chance of learning how to use hands or head, and to acquire habits of steady industry, become an efficient workman?" Even before Malthus published his work Botero had pointed out how efficiently State-aided emigration would work towards relieving a congested condition of population. In our own day Thorold Rogers advocated emigration of children by the State as an admirable means of enriching the colonies, and removing the pressure which lies so heavily upon us all at home. Of course, the excellence of his plan lies in the point that children could not have formed sentimental ties to home and surroundings. Wherever it has been tried by individuals, such as Dr. Barnardo and Miss Rye, the plan of rescuing children and despatching them to our colonies has succeeded beyond the most sanguine expectations of those who have undertaken it. The time has come when such a beneficial work to all concerned should not be relegated to individual, and necessarily spasmodic effort, but should be undertaken by the State. The benefit of this is palpable. It must be borne in mind that individual interests are protected by the community

and *vice versa*. The individual, therefore, owes something to the community, and by withdrawing himself, not, however, to his own detriment, but the contrary, from its hurt, he benefits it as well as himself. Under a judicious and effective system of State-aided emigration both the community and the individual would benefit, the individual inasmuch as he would have better opportunities for advancement in life put before him, and the community inasmuch as it would have one less to trouble it. This it would do in contributing the funds necessary to bring about this benefit to itself, and the money would be well expended, for it would lessen the expense which would necessarily ensue if the individual had remained within it. Even in its own self-interest the community should undertake a large system of wholesale emigration. No greater question for statesmen to solve can exist than how to deal with the vast army of the unemployed which is arising up in these modern days. It is altogether a new problem, and requires the most serious consideration. No such question has ever arisen before, that men who are anxious to work should have it denied them. In it are involved interests which it appears nothing but emigration, on a large State-aided scheme, can solve. Lamentable and terrible as the conditions are at present under which many worthy Englishmen have to live, they will not have existed in vain if they succeed in calling the attention of everybody to the necessity for their relief, and to the priceless boon which we have in our colonies towards reducing so many grievances. Major Seton Churchill writes: "What an immense field lies open for the excess of population in England in the unoccupied parts of our empire." He recalls to our recollection Livingstone's remark of the dislike evinced by the people of England to having children, it was a sure indication from God that they ought to move on into another country. "We bring Australian meat to England to be eaten by Englishmen instead of sending out Englishmen to eat it there, and thus, by reducing the demand in England, lower the price of meat here." He attributes all the miseries and wants of our poor suffering fellow-creatures, living in semi-starvation here, to the lack of a wise system of emigration. "Send off emigrants," he says, "and the number of hands in the crowded markets of England will be reduced, wages then, like water, would find a proper level, and the extremities of poverty would be lessened."

At the Manchester Church Congress Bishop Barry, late of Sydney, where he derived the foundation for his remarks, said :—

“I tell you a simple remedy for over-population is to be found by means of emigration to that magnificent colonial empire which God has so prominently given to England above all other countries.” The opponents of emigration say that it is at the best but a very mixed blessing, as it is only the most vigorous, enterprising, and daring of the race who go, and that only the weak and careless remain behind. But under a wholesale, judicious, and systematic system of emigrating families this need not be the case; the best would not be picked out, and the worst left behind. The system would deal with averages, and not with extremes. None but those physically or mentally incapable would be retained.

Under the present ill-regulated and insufficient schemes of emigration, the arguments of those who oppose emigration on the ground of the best leaving and the worst remaining are very solid and true; such is no doubt the case, and will always be so as long as the question of emigration is left to the individual to decide. In that sense it is weakening, because it is only the daring who go, provided always that they have the means. All this needs a radical reformation. Under a general mode of emigration, from which all except the diseased would profit, these objections could have no foundation. Moreover, if it be said that the fairly prosperous would not go, and that only paupers would, the former would have to be reminded that their prosperity at home could only be maintained as long as somebody went, and that whatever prosperity they enjoyed at home could be doubled in the colonies, together with a firm assurance that they would be enabled to bequeath a much larger inheritance to their children, who in their turn would also have much better chances of succeeding in life than if they had been born at home. “Colonization from such a country as ours ought to be of hope, and not of despair. It ought not to be looked upon as the last and worst shift that a family can come to, but the performance of an imperative duty to our blood, our religion, and to our human kind. As soon as children grow up, parents ought to provide for their removal to parts of the world—to our own colonies, of course—where every addition is an accession of strength, and every member of the colonial community feels in his

inmost heart the more the merrier. It is a monstrous evil that all our healthy, blooming, and handsome daughters of England have not a fair chance at least of becoming the centre of domestic affection. The state of society which entirely precludes so many of them from occupying the position of wife and mother, and which Englishwomen are so well calculated to fill, gives rise to enormous evils in the opposite sex." (Livingstone.)

In old days to "list as a soldier" was considered about the greatest degradation a young man could undergo, and only the worthless did so. As soon as the condition of the soldier was improved the situation underwent a vast change, and what was formerly considered to be a degradation is now considered as an honour. So precisely was it reckoned with regard to emigration, and is even far too much so still. Wherever there was a scapegrace, spendthrift, ne'er-do-well son, the last remedy was to send him to the colonies, but things are happily changing in this respect, and would a great deal more if the proper, necessary conditions for emigration were sufficiently explained, and help given to carry it out. Let us hear what Darwin wrote on these subjects of Neo-Malthusianism and its most effective remedy, emigration: "I cannot but doubt greatly whether artificial checks would be advantageous to the world at large. Suppose that such checks had been in action during the last two or three centuries, or even for a shorter time, in Britain, what a difference it would have made to the world, when we consider America, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa! No words can exaggerate the importance, in my opinion, of our colonization for the future history of the world. If it were universally known that the birth of children could be prevented, and this was not thought immoral by married persons, would there not be great danger of extreme profligacy amongst unmarried women, and might we not become like the arreois societies in the Pacific? In the course of a century France will tell us the result in many ways. We can already see that the French nation does not spread or increase much." (Letter to Mr. Gaskell, dated November 15th, 1878.)

The chapter on colonies in Seely's *Expansion of England* should be carefully studied by all who are interested in this urgent question of population and its results. Here is an important extract: "We may be very sure that never was any nation half so much crowded for want of room in the olden

time as our nation is now. Populations so dense as that of modern England are a phenomenon quite new, at least in Europe. We continually speak of our own country as crowded, and as the rate of increase of population is tolerably constant, we sometimes ask ourselves with alarm what will be the condition half a century hence? The territory, we say, is a fixed quantity, we have but 120,000 square miles, it is crowded already, and yet the population doubles itself in about seventy years; what will become of us? Now here is a curious example of our habit of leaving our colonies out of account. I find that the territory governed by our Queen is almost of boundless extent. If there is pauperism in Wiltshire or Dorsetshire this is but complementary to unowned wealth in Australia; on the one side there are men without property, on the other there is property waiting for men. And we do not allow these two facts to come together in our minds, but brood anxiously, and almost despairingly, over the problem of pauperism, and when colonies are mentioned, we ask what is the good of colonies."

At the present time we see a further expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race taking place in Canada and the United States. The overplus population of both of these countries is moving eastwards; yet this movement is not looked upon with fear lest the older settled parts westward should be impoverished of their best men. It is considered to be nothing else but the natural result of an already congested population seeking its proper outlet. Emigration there, of course, does not present the same difficulties to overcome as it does in England; it is easier to travel by land than to sail over the ocean. If this did not flow between England and Canada, the pressure caused by an excess of population in England would not have arisen.

One important economic point necessarily connected with a large State-aided system of emigration remains to be commented upon. It is that some at least of the emigrants would certainly require some small amount of capital to maintain themselves in the colony until there was work found for them to do. This could be considerably overcome by the importing colony making sufficient arrangements for their incoming, and so could have the work or the land waiting for the men. None need be sent until places were ready to be filled. It would be but a matter of detail. It certainly would be better

than the present *laissez faire* system of leaving the emigrant to find a place, as he has to do now, which, more often than not, he has to wait for until all his savings have been uselessly wasted in enforced idleness. Even if the expenditure of some capital to each emigrant was required, the same remark applies here as to the whole system of State-aided emigration, namely, that it would be better to expend this on a hopeful future for the emigrant than upon a hopeless one of pauperism, and consequently a still greater expense for all, in the old country. It would be a judicious expenditure for the community, as by it pauperism at home would largely decrease, and the expense of the poor-rates would be considerably lessened. Surely it would be better to help the willing and deserving poor to earn a life long competence by emigration to the colonies than to be at the great expense of building large workhouses and lunatic asylums, to which latter enormously-increasing numbers are being annually driven through anxiety, drink, and poverty. Our wealth is daily increasing, but so also is our poverty. Would it not be best to expend some of the former upon decreasing the latter by what manifestly seems the only effective way of doing so, namely, the adoption of a large system of emigration?

Our colonial empire is the glory of our race, and the envy of the entire world. Surely the time has come when it should be populated by means of economic science rather than by an absurd *laissez faire* system of individual needs or temperament. By such means two most desirable objects would be gained—increased prosperity at home, and further grandeur and importance obtained for our colonies. Those whose desire it is to cope successfully with the increased difficulties which an excess of population always engenders, with the ever-augmenting wish to adopt Neo-Malthusianism, will certainly find in emigration the only real remedy for these evils. If some wise and comprehensive scheme for dealing with the enormous population which has lately arisen in the United Kingdom, and which seems to be most likely and successfully found in emigration than in anything else, is not soon adopted, we shall soon be face to face with two very portentous facts—either those who have succeeded in the present unfair battles of life will be called upon in a continually-increasing ratio, until it becomes too gigantic to be borne with equanimity any longer, to support those who have not so succeeded, or Neo-

Malthusianism will be adopted upon a very large scale both by rich and poor. Let us be wise while we are yet able ; there is still time for improvement in many social matters before these evil necessities beset us. If it is not vigorously and judiciously undertaken now, social difficulties will become so magnified, that what might have been effectual in restraining them while in the bud will be useless when they have become full blown.

TEMPERANCE CONSIDERED IN ITS RELATIONSHIP TO NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

IT is to be hoped that what has been already written may prove sufficient to enable the Neo-Malthusian to understand that an abundant population, in which no artificial and unjust restrictions to an equal share of general production existed, can never be a cause of poverty, but, on the contrary, the chief producer of wealth. The Neo-Malthusian has yet to learn that his chief object should be to remove or reduce all adverse conditions to creating and acquiring equal wealth. It is only beating a dead horse to say that intemperance is one of the great causes of poverty, disease, and crime. The late Sir Andrew Clark stated as his conviction, that seven out of every ten cases in hospitals were there in consequence of the use of alcohol. We learn that twenty-four per cent. of the lunacy of Europe is caused by hereditary influence, but the same percentage is allotted to drink. The fiftieth report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, January 1st, 1896, assigns intemperance in drink to be the cause of 20·9 per cent. of male and 8·1 per cent. of female lunacy. Everybody who thinks at all must be aware of the immense amount of disease which intemperance generates. It is said that if the nation became temperate half of the present hospital accommodation would be sufficient. So much for the point of intemperance and disease. With regard to the poverty which it causes one may well stand aghast. When we think of the gigantic sum of money which the nation annually spends on alcohol, we have indeed cause for wonder and horror. When we learn that that amount of money reaches £140,000,000 a year we may well be amazed. When one thinks of the overwhelming amount of good which this stupendous sum of money would be capable of effecting towards reducing poverty, and yet that it is the chief cause of it, we may well wonder at man's

folly and crime. This is indeed aggravated by the fact that all medical authorities assure us that alcohol is not a food, but, on the contrary, waste, and, moreover, a substance detrimental to human life. The waste which it brings about in the very classes where thrift is needed most is tremendous. "Drink wastes £60,000,000 a year of workmen's wages." (Woodhouse.) We spend on our army and navy, that is to say, upon our national insurance, about thirty millions; yet five times that amount upon an almost useless commodity. It is appalling. Taking the whole of Europe into consideration, the amount of money which is spent upon alcohol must be indeed almost beyond comprehension. Professor Denis, of Geneva, gives the annual amount of alcohol consumed per head of population as follows:—

France	13	quarts
Switzerland	10	"
Belgium	10	"
Italy	10	"
Germany	9	"
England	9	"
Sweden	4	"
Norway	3	"
Canada	2	"

It can be seen from this that France has entered into the unenviable post formerly held by England, and so for the future nobody must believe that the French are our superiors in temperance. Writing in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15th, 1897, Fouillée says: "From 1861 to 1865 the average number of the insane in France through alcoholism amounted to three hundred; in 1896 it had risen to three thousand five hundred. In Normandy, where alcoholism rages with an extraordinary intensity, the stillbirths and infant mortality have increased to 28 per 100; the number of rejected conscripts has trebled; marriages have decreased by an eighth, the ratio of illegitimacy a quarter; the birth-rate, which was 28 per 1000 in 1880, has fallen to 18 in 1894; the death-rate has increased to 28 per 1000. Fourteen communes in the neighbourhood of Caen to-day only contain 5028 inhabitants, instead of 9200 in 1880. During this period there were only 95 births for 171 deaths, 21 marriages against 13 *filles-meres*, and 44 conscripts, 24 of whom were rejected."

The average expenditure of the people of Great Britain upon alcohol is four pounds two shillings a head ; in Ireland two pounds thirteen. The taxation upon the two, however, is most unequal. The Englishman, Scotchman, and Welshman, who spend four pounds two shillings each, are only taxed fifteen shillings and sixpence each ; while the Irishman, who spends only two pounds thirteen, has to pay thirteen shillings and sixpence. When we look into the whole of the matters connected with temperance, there is room for much searching of heart. A great deal of the intemperance which we all so deeply deplore is caused by misery. The cynic believes the poor to be wholly given over to drink, and therefore passes them by on the other side ; but such is not always the case. Even if all the poor of England were wallowing in drunkenness, is there not a cause ? To the great credit of some of the extremely poor, they are able, in a wonderful way, to refrain, but they are the exception, not the rule. Environment is too much for the majority, acting, as it does, upon already weakened constitutions. When we speak of drunkenness amongst the poor, do we always make sufficient allowance for the terrible lowering circumstances and surroundings in which the large majority of our fellow-countrymen have to live—the cruel monotony, the exhausting toil, the dreadful anxiety, the unwholesome house ? If we had to live amongst these, would we not likewise fall victims to the desire and craving for some sedative to assuage our sufferings ? We can never lessen intemperance by Acts of Parliament. We may reduce the number of houses of temptation, but the morals and customs of the people can only be touched by higher methods. Surely our manifest duty is to attack the causes of this intemperance, which is doing so much harm throughout the world, and not the effects. First, and before all, two things are absolutely necessary, omitting others for the present—better housing for the poor and better sanitation. These would be better and nobler objects to work for than to seek to deteriorate morality. We know very well that when the nervous system is lowered by impure air it seeks support in alcohol. A Dean of Manchester said that if he had to live as many workers in our towns have to do he would infallibly become a drunkard.

It is a blot upon our national profession of Christianity, upon our entire administration, that capitalists who feed upon

the rents of unwholesome houses in our cities should be allowed to do so any longer. Sixteen or seventeen years have elapsed since the Commission on the Housing of the Poor presented its report, yet what has been done towards relieving the unjust conditions under which the poor have to suffer in this respect? If the working classes had better houses, better sanitation, better surroundings, there would not be the same temptations to deaden their miseries in drink. The homes of the people, the producers of wealth, the backbone and sinew of the country, should not be left to greedy and unscrupulous capitalists to build cheaply and scandalously, and then grow fat and rich upon their exorbitant rents. The homes of the people, not merely artisans' dwellings, but homes, sweet homes, should be built by the municipalities, by the community, by the help of a consolidated fund, and then they would not be miserable barracks, but comfortable homes. The people of England would then be enabled to live amidst wholesome surroundings, instead of the conditions of to-day, and build up again capable populations to take the places of those whom we see festering in the dens of the cities at the present time. Guthrie described them well as they existed even in his time, and how much worse they have grown since his time we are well aware: "The unfurnished floor, the naked walls, the sickening atmosphere, the patched and dusty window, through which a sunbeam, like hope, is faintly stealing, the ragged, hunger-bitten, and sad-faced children, the ruffian man, the heap of straw, where some wretched mother sleeps off yesterday's debauch. They called the street at Jerusalem where the Saviour bore His cross the Via Dolorosa, and I have thought that many of our streets to-day can be baptized with the sorrow of as awful a name—with so many countenances that have misery stamped upon them as plain as if it were burnt in with a hot iron, hunger staring at us out of those hollow-eyed, drink-palsied men, and those drink-blotched and bloated women; sad and yellow infants who pine away into slow death, with their weary heads lying so pitifully on the shoulders of some half-dehumanized woman; this poor little child who never smiles, without shoe or stocking on his ulcerated feet, limping along, with a bottle in his emaciated hand, to buy a parent drink with the few pence he would fain spend on a loaf of bread. How has it wrung my heart to see a ragged boy staring greedily in at a window on the food he

dared not touch, to watch him as he alternately lifted his naked feet lest they should freeze to the icy pavement. He starves in the midst of abundance, neglected among a people who would run to the rescue of a horse fallen on the slippery road. Poor wretch, he knows not a Bible or a mother's prayers! If he did, would he not bar our way as we go to church, and, holding out his gaunt arms, tell us that in God's book it was written that pure religion and undefiled before God the Father would be best exemplified by clothing his naked limbs and filling out his hollow cheeks?"

It would be very instructive to examine the statistics of the convictions for disorder and drunkenness in the cities, and compare them with the same in the country. The former vastly preponderate over the latter. The population of East Anglia, the most agricultural in the kingdom, is also the soberest. "The bad state of the atmosphere of our large cities certainly inclines men more to drink than the better air of the country." (Bagehot.)

In this most useful work of obtaining better housing and surroundings for the poor, with a view to reduce the temptations of drink, the Neo-Malthusian would find a better field for his philanthropic energy than in promoting immorality. With regard to this important matter of temperance, we are told that the one essential condition of real improvement and help can only now be found by changing men's characters, but how can character change as long as it is kept deteriorated and degraded by most cruel and evil circumstances and surroundings?

We are, after all is said and done, most certainly nothing but the creatures of environment; that makes character. Take a child of a patrician, delicately bred and nurtured for some years in refinement, and place it in the midst of plebeian, degraded surroundings, and then see how soon it will respond to its new associations. Our invariable tendency is to retrograde, not to improve. As long as people are forced to live in environment which continually tends to degrade them, it is utterly useless to reason with them of temperance and its many virtues; the spirit to act may be present, but the powers warring against the flesh will always prove too insurmountable for poor human nature to overcome. Pestiferous, steaming, stinking alleys and dens can only produce intemperance. It would indeed require a heroic character, moulded in a different

form to which the majority are, as well as gigantic physical power, to be able to withstand all the temptations to deaden the misery which the inhabitant of the city has necessarily to undergo. Brutalizing sights, crowded rooms, unhealthy houses, drive our poor flesh and blood to crave for some alleviating comfort, and this it readily finds in what is cheap and nearest at hand—alcohol. In a recent sermon, Canon Gore said: "Why do people drink too much? It is at least very largely to escape from themselves and their surroundings." There is a terrible but exceedingly striking saying of one of Her Majesty's judges when he had been to Manchester: "I understand why people get drunk; it is the shortest way out of Manchester."

Consider the amusements which the slum-dweller has, and then compare them with the ceaseless round of pleasures which the rich are able to indulge in from year's end to year's end. Think of the few holidays which the poor man can have in the course of the year, always remembering the deductions from his wages which they entail. Think of the annual excursion—can anybody call it a day of pleasure?—up at 3 a.m., home at midnight; heat, crush, strife, mothers with screaming babies; if the day be wet, nothing but the public-house. We even hear of whole trains full of people arriving at the place of their destination early in the day with all their passengers helplessly drunk, and the trains drawn into shuntings, leaving the drunken in them to recover as they best can. Every possibility of rational and innocent pleasure is denied the toiler in the slums. England has indeed long ceased to be "Merric England"; yet we wonder why people drink for mere drinking's sake. The man who lives in the dens of the city, and who is at the same time a total abstainer, is indeed a far higher, more abstemious, more moral specimen of humanity than the well-to-do abstainer. In the case of the former the physical temptation to give way is almost overwhelming, in the latter it is only what idleness and viciousness engender. People wonder how it is that increased general prosperity always means a heavier drink bill. The reason is obvious; it is that increased wealth means greater ability to obtain the means whereby misery can be deadened. Writing on the differences between town and country life, Mr. Galton says: "The feeling of insufficient and pure air are manifested in the forms of faintness, sense of exhaustion and

weariness. These are obviously due, not to the lung sense alone, but to the lowered conditions of town life." In a recent article in the *Contemporary Review*, Mr. Mallock wrote that it is weakness of will which in the first instance leads to drunkenness. But how is this weakness of will caused but by the lowered powers of the body suffering from horrible environment? Remove the latter, and both would soon recover their proper tone. "One of the worst features of this destructive town life is, that the actual physical power to work is considerably reduced." (Woodhouse.) No right-minded man ever objects to work, and hard work; all he claims is proper and fit places to do it in, with no pestilential atmosphere which irresistibly compels him to imbibe noxious drugs.

It is dreadful to think of all the waste of human life, the waste of producing power, the waste of wealth which goes on throughout England, all caused by alcohol. The poor, the wretched are daily more and more robbed; their hard-earned wages are being transferred to rich brewers and brewery syndicates. Many a man who could be in excellent health if he had had but a fair chance in life is staggering on to an early and a drunkard's grave, and yet it is not his fault; he is the unhappy victim of what we are pleased to call our advanced civilization. Unjust distribution has transformed what might have been an excellent specimen of our race into something lower than a brute. Ancient nations were not drunken, they could not have done what they did if they were; neither are savages until our so-called civilization forces it upon them.

With regard to this question of drunkenness following in the train of what we term civilization, let us bear in mind Maudsley's remark that civilization can make brutes still greater brutes, and certainly more dangerous than if they were in a state of nature. Preaching upon the example which English civilization sets with regard to drink, the Archdeacon of Manchester said: "When these centuries are looked back upon, as we look back upon the age of Babylon, or Athens, or Rome; looked back upon, it may be, from centres of civilization as remote from England as we are from those ancient capitals, what will be the verdict? Will it not then be said that we corrupted every nation we touched by our drink? It was lately said by the Archdeacon of Bombay that in India we had made a hundred drunkards for every Christian. Every

Hindoo patriot complains that under our patronage drinking spreads like an epidemic. In nearly every village, I hear that a Government liquor shop is annually sold to the highest bidder, who is then bound to force the sale in order to recoup himself. It is deadly to their health and their morality, it is in flat contravention of their religion. The Hindoos are temperate, the Mahometans are abstainers, but the Christians so-called are undermining both. When a man is seen drunk the saying is, 'That man has left Mahomet, and gone to Jesus.'

The curse of drink has not only fallen upon English men and women, but upon their children; it has been left to these times to produce that terrible specimen of humanity the "whisky child." How difficult, it is said by many, to understand the designs of God in this matter of children's care and protection. How some are born into surroundings which cannot but elevate and hinder from sin and degradation, where there are boundless opportunities of elucidating the best side of human nature, of practising virtue, and improving all the faculties of mind and body. Yet, on the other hand, the large majority of children are born into surroundings where none of these ennobling possibilities are found; begotten by vicious parents, literally reared by alcohol, bred in dens of iniquity, how can they ever grow up to be respectable citizens, and, which is of still greater importance, how can they be fit to enter God's kingdom?

The same remark which I made before on the struggle for life equally applies here. These conditions are not of God's but of man's making. From him to whom much is given shall much be required. Those who have had no advantages here will, we may be sure, be judged in accordance with God's pure and perfect justice. Do we fully realize the piteous conditions under which we force the poor to drag out their lives until death releases them? When the rich feel "out of sorts" change of air is immediately ordered—the sea, the mountain, the health resort, and yet the air from which they are ordered to remove themselves from is comparatively perfect. Then let us consider what chance the poor have of removal from the vitiated atmosphere which they have to breathe year after year. Is it possible that human nature could resist alcohol under the conditions which the poor have to live? Professor Wallace says: "The great cities contain within their bounds dense masses of people living in cellars and hovels, and airless, filthy

courts, again and again condemned as unfit for human habitation. People live in unsightly and unwholesome houses, packed together in rows like pens for cattle. They have no field or garden-ground for profitable occupation or healthy enjoyment, their young children can get no wholesome milk, and often no playground but the alley and the kennel." It is utterly useless to speak of temperance, religion, or morality to unfortunate creatures doomed to live under such conditions as the extreme poor have to do now. Steeped to the hilt in chronic want and bitter privations as they are, living under such depressing influences, minds always haunted with the terror of not being able to find sufficient food, how can they give any heed to the call of a higher life? We bitterly regret and feel the disgrace which attaches to England for carrying the blighting influence of drink wherever it goes; but where has the desire for it been born and bred but in the dens and pestiferous streets of our cities? The agricultural inhabitants of England are not drunken. Surely our work should be, if we want to remove this blot from English character, to render the atmosphere and surroundings of our cities more bearable for human nature. Those who oppose the Christian Social Union and its work say that the present social movement merely panders to the physical needs of the body, and leaves out of consideration altogether the higher things of the soul, and that "seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you," is the only true rule of life; that there were workpeople at Corinth, etc., and that St. Paul did not minister to bodily wants there, but preached to them the first precept of the Gospel, which was to conquer self and sin. I reply that the workpeople of Corinth did not live under the terrible social conditions which our poor have to do now; they were not pent up in stifling dens, crushed by monotonous, ever-increasing toil. Cardinal Newman said long ago that the quasi-heathens of our large towns did not exist in the beginning of the Gospel, and that most of the moral degradation of the world arose entirely from physical drawbacks, and thus consequent misery and despair. In our Lord's time the Jews were a thoroughly sober nation. They only drank their native, harmless wines, and alcohol was unknown to them. The stupefying, vile, spirituous concoctions of modern days were happily not then discovered. The large majority of our city and town populations are growing up

utterly irreligious, wholly agnostic, without God in the world, without any hope in the future, without moral order of any kind. In spite of church and board schools, juvenile crime is increasing. If this statement be doubted, then read the pages of the recently-published Blue Book on the statistics of crime, and note what is written there on Government authority. Notwithstanding that the Education Act has been in force since 1871, the morality of boy and girl life is worse than ever it was. Does education, then, fail to improve moral character? Not altogether; but in the case of the large majority the struggle to live has become too hard to let moral power have its full sway and exercise. Honesty, it is said, is impossible to be met with either in the individual or the mart. The shopman and shopgirl tell us that if they were scrupulously honest they must needs starve. Clerks, traders, merchants, *et hoc genus omne*, tell us that honest trading has ceased to exist; everybody cheats, and everybody is cheated. Commercial morality has become a byword. The struggle to live has become so terrific, competition has become so keen, the "cutting" so close, that the trader is forced to sail very close to the wind in all his transactions. Let him be as honest-minded as ever he will, if he is to live at all he must do as others do. The fact is, that before we can introduce a higher morality with any degree of success we must improve and cultivate the surface on which its seeds are to be sown.

No people on the earth, no matter how savage, have ever had to live the lives which the poor of Europe have to do now, confined as they are in filthy, stifling dens. Their lives cannot for a moment be compared with those of savages. The savage, even if he hungers sometimes, has the pure air of heaven to draw into his lungs. What has the poor man of modern civilization to breathe? The savage has no cruel, monotonous, never-ceasing toil to undergo; in very many respects his condition is far superior to the European workman.

It is a question if his morality is not also much higher; certainly the Moslem system is much purer and better; it does not produce drunkards and prostitutes. No Moslem city in the East could produce what our boasted civilization does in only the West End of London at night, not taking into consideration thousands of such scenes in other cities of

England. "One who lives amidst the courts and alleys of a great city, and sees the filth of human life; one who can see the girls of twelve, lost to all sense of shame and decency, proceeding on their way to infamy, with no hope of a friendly hand to stay them on their downward path; one who knows that, as rats undermine a building, squalid crime is at work upon the very foundations of morality and law, must not, cannot, till he has left these scenes for peaceful nature, be an optimist. I pass through filthy lanes, I see the most squalid beastliness, oaths, quarrels, fights, drunkenness. These people pursue the same dull, never-thinking course of existence, the only variation to which they look forward being that of hard drinking. At four years old the children swear like troopers, taught to do so by their parents. Yet England is a nominal Christian country!"

The late Bishop Thorold used to tell us that when he first went to St. Giles an old man said to him, "Ah, you won't be long here before you'll see there's no God." The fact is that Christianity has utterly failed to influence those who are compelled by most cruel and adverse economic conditions to lie in darkness, in the valley and shadow of an enforced moral death. We have yet to adopt the religion of Christ. He never spoke to people while He was on earth who were obliged to live the lives our poor have to do now. Even then He censured and warned the rich. What would He say to our modern plutocrats and capitalists? Up to the present time religion has kept men back from desperate revolutions; but now many millions are growing up throughout the world, not merely indifferent to, but absolutely hostile to Christianity as it has hitherto been presented to them. They are learning to live without any morality or religion whatever. What will the future bring? Even in England political jealousies, horrible rivalries between sects, are doing their utmost to prevent Christian parents from obtaining the special religious instruction which they desire for their children. All this miserable squabble between nominal Christians goes on, while the devastating enemy of infidelity is at the gate, only waiting for the moment to rush in and submerge all the foundations of morality.

If those people who desire a mere secular education for the children of England would but study an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, January 15th, 1897, by Alfred Fouillé

de l'Académie des Sciences Morales, termed "Les Jeunes Criminels, l'Ecole et la Presse," they would change their opinions. Remarking upon what an irreligious education produces, he says: "En somme, la criminalité a triplé chez nous depuis cinquante ans, quoique la population ait à peine augmenté. Dans la période 1880 à 1893 la criminalité grandit encore beaucoup plus rapidement; en dix ans on voit le nombre des enfans criminels s'accroître du quart. La précocité est une des marques caractéristiques, un des traits douloureux de notre temps. Une exagération de férocité, une recherche de lubricité, la prostitution enfantine va aussi croissant, et on a estimé à 40,000 en dix ans le nombre des enfans atteints. En 1830 on constait 5 suicides par 100,000 inhabitants; en 1892, il y en avait 24; les suicides des enfans au-dessous de seize ans, extrêmement rares jadis, atteignaient déjà en 1887 le nombre de 55. Dans cette même année nous avons en 375 suicides de jeunes gens âgés de seize à vingt et un ans; les suicides d'enfans âgés de moins de seize ans ont été de 87." He also tells us that out of every hundred convicted boys and girls only two have come from religious schools. Out of every hundred convict children imprisoned in La Petite Roquette, the average is eleven from a religious, eighty-nine from a secular school. We can hardly imagine such a state of things; but he also tells us that not long ago the Minister of Justice declared in the Chamber that every day in Paris more than thirty thousand grossly obscene pamphlets were distributed gratis at the doors of all the schools. Notwithstanding all this evidence, we are still told that France has reached a very high standard, one which it would be well for England to follow, but the fact is, that France is in far greater difficulties than we are with regard to immorality and drunkenness. The causes, however, of these things have a similar origin in both countries.

Formerly it was taught that all the evils arising from unequal distribution of wealth and injustice were inevitable in the conduct of human affairs, and that all we could do was to drag out a miserable existence here, and that afterwards, in heaven somehow, it would all be made up to us. Such was the Puritan's faith and practice. But surely the kingdom of Christ, His church, is militant here on earth against cruelty and injustice. Are we to teach that, although Christ is with us here on earth in His church, yet His attributes of love and

justice are not? Are we to believe that there is no place or room for justice on earth, that it must be relegated to heaven alone? It most assuredly is not God's will that justice should not reign here; and when we work to establish it more fully in this present world, we may be sure that we are on God's side.

Before we can successfully impose the structure of the whole religion of Christ upon the suffering multitude, we must first introduce the simple, natural, moral law of justice. Let us take the case of London alone. The church has been in possession for twelve hundred years. What is the result? Let us see, and *ex uno disce omnes*. Its population to-day amounts to 6,048,555, out of which the communicants of the church amount to but an insignificant three per cent. ! It seems hardly possible that such should be the deplorable fact, but so it is. When we examine the numbers and conditions of those who attend any place of worship, we can easily observe how the poor are conspicuous by their absence. Note the appearance of an ordinary congregation anywhere, and then see if the Gospel is now preached to the poor and needy. Speaking upon the present religious tendencies of the masses, the Bishop of London said: "The condition of life for them is that of perpetual struggle for existence, and they have no time or thought for education, art, patriotism, or religion. Religion requires time, and they have no time." Hundreds of thousands hear and see nothing of religion during the week, and on Sundays are so tired that they stay in bed all day, else they could not drag out their wearied, worn lives. Ask the omnibus and tram people what opportunities they have for any religious duties, and then let Christian consciences dwell upon the answer. That Christ is with His church there cannot be the slightest doubt. All that is needed is loyalty to Him and it. We cannot but observe the divinely-guided destiny which, after the long-stagnant Erastianism of the Hanoverian period, brought into being the evangelical movement and the enthusiast John Wesley. Then in later times came its complement, the Catholic admixture, and its leader Pusey. And now there is being added, to complete the structure, the necessary truth of the great brotherhood of man, that in Christ we are all brethren, and that when one suffers in soul or body all suffer likewise; that in Him there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor

female, for we are all one in Christ Jesus. Let this be more fully taught and practised, and then the world will be nearer its regeneration than it has ever been before. The reasons whereby the present Christian social movement has arisen are obvious. They are not merely humanitarian or philanthropic. Those clergy who, seeking to save the souls of the lost and fallen, have gone down into the dens and alleys of the suffering poor, have been obliged to admit that so long as the physical circumstances under which the poor have to live are so adverse, it is impossible for them to learn anything of morality and righteousness. Wherever, throughout the neglected districts of our large cities, university settlements or missions are founded by the clergy, their first objects are to open clubs of all sorts, out of which it is hoped in time to collect congregations for their churches. The opponents of these measures are always to be found amongst the ranks of those who are ignorant of the distress which extreme inequality of wealth always brings in its train. Many trust in education as a means to produce morality and refined types of humanity; but how can it have such an effect when old and young, men and women, boys and girls, are herded together in one or two rooms, where the decencies of a civilized life are utterly impossible? Moral platitudes may be given in the school, immoral examples are copiously poured out in the streets and at home, and which are the most likely to be acted upon by the children? When we speak concerning temperance and purity to boys and girls who are compelled to live under evil circumstances of life, we speak to beings who are altogether on a different plane concerning them to what our boys and girls are. They have been nurtured up in surroundings where everything that treats of intemperance and purity is hidden from their eyes. Not so the poor boy and girl; from their earliest years they have been only too familiar with sights and language which drown out all temperance, morality, and purity. Comparing again for a moment, for the sake of argument and knowledge, the present conditions of life, which the church has been left to deal with, with those which prevailed in the time of the Apostles, we can readily observe how much more difficult it is to carry on the work of Christ now. Opponents of the present Christian social movement may say, Consider the slavery and the utter disregard for human life which existed then. Quite so; but it must be

remembered that a slave is and was a chattel, a possession of considerable pecuniary value, and most certainly did not live then under the pitiable conditions of life which our poor have to do now. The English mind is familiar with a false idea of slavery. Except in the conveyance of slaves to their destination, their condition in modern times even, much more the case in ancient, when they were very leniently treated, is not nearly as pitiable as that of our white slaves is now. It is ridiculous to say that it is. I have seen a good deal of slavery, where it was and is still to be witnessed, both in the Pacific and Brazil, and I am quite sure that it cannot be compared for a moment, as regards human suffering, with the present condition of many of our white slaves in our great cities. If we turn to Africa for further evidence, where slavery still exists on a large scale, we invariably find that it is only in the transit that the slave suffers. The Universities' Mission to Central Africa is a very good judge of what slavery really is, and this is its report: "When with their masters it does not appear that slaves are, as a rule, cruelly treated, but rather the contrary." (Central Africa, September, 1895.) All that the commonplace English mind knows about slavery is through *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, that product of a hysterical genius, which is very inaccurate in many particulars. It is contrary to human reason to suppose that a slave-owner would, contrary to his pecuniary interests, ill-treat, or do anything to diminish the working power of his slaves. Moreover, slaves were not tortured in mind with the continually-recurring anxiety whence the means to provide, and in addition to that the fear of illness, or where the food for themselves or their children was to come from; board and lodging they had in plenty, and cold they knew nothing of. I know very well that, if I had to choose, I would infinitely prefer the life of the modern slave to that which many of our English poor have to undergo at present. If we desire to improve the morality of our working population we must improve their present degrading surroundings. All must admit that environment creates character, and as long as the former continues to be productive of abasement, so must also be the latter. It makes one very impatient sometimes to hear some sleek, well-to-do temperance lecturer boast of his abstinence, and thank God he is not as others are; but compel him to live in Flower and Dean Street in London, or in the neighbourhood of Paddy's market in Liverpool, and

then see what he would be. It is so very easy to be religious and devotional when the circumstances of life are easy and comfortable; but change them into what is low, squalid, and degrading, and then see how difficult it is to grow into a saint. Before we can successfully attempt to suppress the evils of that hydra-headed monster drink, we must first descend in thought to the level of those who suffer from evil environment, and then consider if we could, under similar conditions, resist the fatal fascinations which drunkenness affords. How can we with any hope of success preach temperance, urgently needed as it is, when even pure water, one of the necessities of life, is made a vehicle of profit for the shareholder in water companies? Is it a wrong thing to advocate that the State should possess the means whereby the poor should freely have what the savage has, pure water to drink? When some of these necessary reforms come to pass we may hopefully expect the triumph of temperance, and consequently a diminution of waste and an increase of wealth. Until then we are merely beating the air, so far as the poor are concerned, when we speak to them of temperance. When we examine further into the whole present economic condition of the poor, we can easily observe that we are rapidly returning to the condition of things which existed at the beginning of the century, when the capitalists and the manufacturers resided in handsome, luxurious residences in the country, and the workers, who produced the profits by which they were able to do so, huddled together in the alleys. Whole cities, where workmen only live, are rising up every year; and these men are labouring for syndicates and companies who are unable to spend their shareholders' dividends upon the moral welfare of their servants, and these, owing to the bare pittance which they receive, are unable to contribute anything towards providing themselves with churches or spiritual help of any kind. The outlook, unless the moral consciences of the rich are awakened, is very, very black.

We cannot also fail to observe that, owing to the difficulty which at present exists for large numbers of people to obtain their necessary food, a great deal of the criminal type of mankind is being developed. It does not always bring itself within the meshes of the law, but nobody can deny that much of human cruelty, vice, and craftiness are fast coming into being. It is surely impossible for the Christian to look upon

human society, as it is now constituted, and say that, after all the centuries of Christianity which have passed over it, it has improved as much as might have been expected. The true spirit of Christ has yet to conquer the world, that one which is able to kindle the fire of devotion to God and one's neighbour. Commenting upon what ought to be, and what one day will be, Professor Heron, of Iowa, writes in *The New Redemption*: "A great idea is now leading the world's thought and lifting its hopes. Everywhere are the signs of universal change. The race is in an attitude of expectancy, straitened until its new baptism is accomplished. Every nerve of society is feeling the first agonies of a great trial that is to try all that dwell on the earth, and issue in a divine deliverance. We are in the beginning of a revolution that will strain all existing religious and political institutions, and test the wisdom and heroism of the earth's purest and bravest souls. It will not do to say the revolution is not coming, or pronounce it of the devil. Revolutions in their wildest forms are the impulses of God moving in tides of fire through the life of man. The dangerous classes in every age and nation are they who, in the interest of religious or political parties, say that the wrong cannot be put right, that selfishness, injustice, and inequality are natural virtues, essential to progress and the stability of civilization. They who say that man's conception cannot be enlarged and purified are the ones who bring disaster and wrath upon the world. There is enough in this world for all to have and enjoy in abundance, if there were a system by which there could be an equitable distribution of that abundance upon the principles of the divine economy. The social revolution marking the closing years of the present century and the dawning of the next is the most crucial and formative since the crucifixion of Christ, it is the call and opportunity of Christendom to become Christian."

It must certainly be admitted that the progress of England in wealth has been out of all proportion to its progress in morality; but we well know that it is in the latter, not in the former, that the family and the nation can alone acquire character and safe progress. With regard to the general laxity in temperance, it is both disheartening and humiliating to have to witness the apathy with which the matter is regarded by Parliament. Vested interests, the monetary versus the moral aspect of the matter, is considered of far too great an

importance. There are far too many within those walls who make their pecuniary interests to rank higher than the moral improvement of the nation. In the meantime the condition of the people, owing to houses of temptation being unnecessarily increased that others may grow rich, is steadily deteriorating, drunkards are propagating their diseased progenies on all sides; yet we stand feebly by, seemingly helpless. We send the drunken parents to prisons and workhouses, we send their children to industrial schools, we pay highly to maintain these poor creatures in all these places. Would not prevention be better than attempted cures, which are seldom, if ever, attained? It is said that if beer—English wine—alone was consumed drunkenness would materially decrease, that it is the vile spirituous compounds which make men become “mad drunk,” as it is called. Surely it is not too much to hope that legislation might do something to repress this part of the evil at least, and that if people are so foolish as to wish for spirits, they should have what is fit to drink, not mere fusel oil. As long as the French drank their own wines they were a temperate nation; now, since they have gained access to what is known as “alcohol d’industrie,” they are rapidly becoming one of the most drunken.

We need not discuss here all the evidence which overwhelmingly proves that nearly all the degradation and crime which are so prevalent are caused by indulgence in alcohol. Judges’ charges, admissions into hospitals, amply prove the truth of that. One fact, however, must come home to the hearts of all; it is that the sum-total of all the rents, not only of workmen’s dwellings, but of all the houses, all the land of England, is less than the sum of money annually spent on drink in England. How wonderful the transformation of the nation would be if it spent on more profitable and healthy objects what it now spends on the useless and hurtful drug alcohol? Strive as we may to inaugurate beneficial social reforms, do what we may to bring about a better distribution of wealth, all will be of no use as long as we do nothing to remove the causes which minister to the sway of the demon drink; we are merely pouring water into a sieve.

It is said that we cannot look to legislation to promote reform in this matter, that it is in moral pressure alone that relief can be found. No doubt it is to the latter that we must look for an abiding reform, but legislation can do a great deal

in lessening poverty from drink. It can enact that when the head of a family or others are ruining themselves and all belonging to them by their drunkenness, they can be tried by a jury of their neighbours, and compelled to undergo seclusion in homes for inebriates, supported by voluntary contributions, under Government supervision. It is lamentable to see children brought to beggary by their parents giving way to drunkenness and debauchery. The law can reduce the number of the houses of temptation, but that it does not do, nor make any serious attempt to do so. Local option has been tried and failed, as it always will and must, for it only provokes hostility from all quarters, and creates invidious distinctions. There are some localities so degraded that their inhabitants would vote for an increase of facilities for getting drunk, not a diminution. Besides, where could a successful line of demarcation be successfully drawn between those wards or parishes which decided that drink could not be obtained within their boundaries and those who did not so decide? The inevitable result would take place, that on one side of the street all the public-houses would be open, and on the other all would be closed ; some publicans, through no fault of their own, would be ruined, and others enriched.

The only way in which the matter can be successfully grappled with is to allot public-houses according to population. If England would only become moderately temperate in alcohol, what an improvement would be visible on all sides. There would then be no unemployed problem, and far less expenditure required for hospitals, into which latter we are told seventy per cent. of the cases are brought through drink. Population might then considerably increase, with no hurtful results to anything or anybody ; children would be healthier, better reared, better nurtured, better fitted when they grew up to augment the wealth of the nation and their own ; above all, their presence in consequence of poverty would not be rebelled against. Here in the field of temperance the Neo-Malthusian can be fought with, and shown that where the conditions of life are not artificially made adverse, and where waste was removed, population is not a hindrance to prosperity, but, on the contrary, the most potent factor in the acquisition of wealth for all.

CO-OPERATIVE HOMES CONSIDERED AS A HELP AGAINST NEO-MALTHUSIANISM

THERE is another matter connected with this question of over-population which it would be well for the Neo-Malthusian to carefully consider before he advises the nation to adopt his scheme of artificially limiting the number of its children. It is that which is known by the name of the Community System, and which simply means several families combining together, and living together under the same roof. There are many among those whose opinions ought to carry great weight who confidently affirm that this system has within it, under proper and judicious management, a very ample field for improving the social and moral condition of our poor and professional classes. We can readily believe that many families now compelled to live more or less isolated, unsatisfactory lives, with no social advantages, would find great comfort and satisfaction by living together in these communities. Large numbers of people are now forced to be content with small houses, restricted pleasures, no society, which they would not be if co-operative homes were open to them. In them the stigma on the lady-help would be avoided. All the women would work, and none would be above the others in social grade. Here they would find boundless opportunities for work, and work of a satisfactory and suitable kind. In these communities domestic duties would be very different to what they are in individual homes. The work would be co-operative—each for all, and all for each. It does not by any means follow that because Owen's ideas in these matters bore no satisfactory results in his time, that the same would be the case now. We have learned a great deal since his time. The economy of living in these homes would be very great. Instead of twenty-five families having to maintain twenty-five kitchens, with all their necessary consumption

of fuel, one kitchen would be sufficient for the twenty-five families. The provisions could be bought wholesale, and what a saving in everybody's income this would effect, especially when we know that now the poor have to buy all they need in halfpennies' worth. For those whose incomes were but small these homes would prove of material benefit, not merely in the pecuniary sense, but also in the social and moral one. The early marriages, and the surrender to sexual gratification by the young, which we all so deeply deplore, have causes which we must consider. As education and public libraries gradually give the young more interest in life, and proper pleasures, in addition, are granted them, they will not think that sexual pleasures are to be the only chief objects in life, and in time these, no doubt, will be much more eschewed than they are now. But still, unless the housing of the poor undergoes radical reform there will always be the incentive to sexualism. The chief cause of early marriages and precocious animal passion lies in the utterly indecent modes of life which the poor have to lead. Brothers and sisters of all ages, fathers and mothers with their children, all packed together into a couple of rooms, what can be the result? It would be contrary to nature to expect or hope for any improvement as long as such a state of things existed. The conditions of home life become unbearable, and the boy and girl are forced into marrying, for if they did not, there would be no homes left them. It is contrary to reason to expect that young people will be content to live by themselves in dreary lodgings. They are actually compelled in these times to cohabit or marry, for unless they do one of these things they are driven to the common lodging-house.

It is all very well for the social reformer to condemn the present system of early marriages, which we well know is so hurtful to us all; but he is bound to acknowledge and remove the causes which give rise to them, and the chiefest of these is the lack of co-operative homes for young men and young women, who would find in them opportunities for economy and comfort. There is ample scope for a philanthropist to build such a home for young men, and another for young women who are engaged in earning their daily bread. Under the present system, when the boy is turned adrift from his father's two rooms, he naturally gets hold of some girl to cook for him, keep his miserable den together, and hence many

tears. No one can doubt that, given the building—it does not seem possible that the poor could ever raise such a thing for themselves—enormous benefits would accrue to the very class which suffers so much at present, and whose influences and actions go so far either to lessen or increase the difficulties of others. Even if a well-disposed millionaire was not able to give the building, there is no doubt that a moderate rent for each room would be forthcoming, and enable him to have some profit on the outlay, that is, if two per cent. would satisfy him.

With regard to a higher social grade of life, we know how difficult it is to find suitable homes for our sons and daughters who go to cities to work. They have either to lead solitary, dull lives in desolate lodgings or in boarding-houses of questionable morality. Naturally there is great hesitation in sending out sons and daughters to face all the temptations of great cities alone. Amusements they must have; if they cannot have innocent, they will most likely seek vicious ones. Here in these homes the lives they have been accustomed to live in their own homes would be continued. Outside, enervating pleasures, with all their dubious surroundings, would not have the attractions they have now. Life in lodgings is not, to say the least, conducive to staying at home in the evenings. Thackeray described it well. It must be a curious specimen of young humanity that would be content to live such a life, evening after evening, without seeking some excitement in the outside world. To the newly-married couple these homes would afford great advantages; there would be no initial expenses of furnishing, etc., which need a great outlay, and compel a large number of suitable people to abstain from marriage altogether. These homes could be managed by a committee or manager elected from amongst the body of members themselves, as is the case in clubs. These latter, merely as places to assemble in the day-time, have succeeded so well, that there is every reason to believe that co-operative homes, which would be really clubs with complete residence added on, would succeed still better. With regard to the initial cost of purchasing or building such homes, and furnishing them, there would be no difficulty so far as the well-to-do are concerned; it is when we come to the poor that the difficulty comes in. Municipalities could help; above all, the philanthropic societies could give of their abundance. Surely

in this case also prevention would be better than cure ; it would be better to found homes where morality and purity could be preserved than to support waifs and strays, the products of the lack of proper homes and care. Well-meaning philanthropists are ready to pour in enormous sums of money into all sorts of wild and crazy schemes, which generally end in benefiting nobody and disgusting the founder. These homes have in them the nucleus of the greatest possible help to all classes of society, poor and rich, and yet the idea has never been put into action yet. Peabody, to his great honour, founded such homes for married people, and did enormous good to hundreds of thousands, but nobody has founded any for young men and women. The experiment has yet to be tried. Needless to say, discipline would be necessary, and characters strictly inquired into ere members were admitted. The honour of one would be the honour of all. This was the idea and principle of the ancient Guilds, and they succeeded admirably. We may readily imagine what these homes might be made to be—beautiful architecture, pleasant cloisters, sunny nooks, grassy quadrangles, all the beauties of university life might be revived, all these advantages, not merely to be limited to bachelors and maidens, but for large numbers of the married as well. There could be the chapel, the chaplain, the hospital, everything calculated to make life as endurable as it can be made. Many I know are longing for such homes to be founded, knowing that in them life would be more joyful, more full of interest, than it is at present, cruelly and ruthlessly cast aside as it is now in far too many instances into loneliness and despair. Above all, these homes, from the less expenditure which co-operation always effects, would prove an enormous benefit in preventing undue postponement of marriage. The advantages indeed seem to be endless. Instead of a poor working-woman being obliged to cook, wash, and work all in one room, thereby driving the husband to the public-house in the evening, each work would be done in its own department, leaving the refectory for food, the recreation-room for amusement. The unmarried women of the homes would do the household work, the mother with the child would be left in peace. What vistas of heavenly comfort these homes seem to open out for both rich and poor ? The school for the children, the doctor for the sick, would all be under the same roof. How glad many a medical man would

be to undertake the post at a fixed income, subscribed co-operatively by the members. He and his family would equally profit by this community system.

Again, if we take into consideration the enormous disadvantages which the labourer and artizan at present have to undergo in going out of their homes early in the morning badly fed, to face the heavy work of the day, how different their condition would be under the community system. Under present arrangements the wife, cumbered as she is with much serving, is unable to send her husband out properly equipped for his work; he is obliged to be content with cold, insufficient food, such as he can scrape together for himself. In the co-operative home the women would be able to have more leisure, and consequently more time to minister to their husbands' needs. In past days Thornton, Mill, and Fawcett asserted that co-operation would prove a valuable help in improving our social condition, and every day's experience adds force to their testimony. In these homes we could put the idea into active working, and there need be no fear as to the result. The scheme is neither new nor original. Those who wish to study the question further will find many suggestions as to details in the admirable essay upon "Unitary Homes" in *Scientific Meliorism*, in *Associated Homes* (Neale), and in *The Creed of Science*, pp. 287-8. In the first of the above will be found a full description of the Familistère, which has succeeded so well in Paris. Those who might desire to combine a secular as well as a religious life in such homes would find an excellent example in that which Nicholas Ferrar carried on so successfully at Little Gidding in the seventeenth century, and which has been so fully described in Canon Carter's work upon the subject. It would be well worthy of the attention of those who are in a position to do so to make an attempt towards the improvement of many of our deserving people by founding or even endowing such co-operative homes as are here suggested.

There is much in this idea which savours of success both in increasing the moral and social improvement of a very large number of our population. The people themselves, however willing, cannot take the first step, for the initial expenses would prove too heavy a burthen for them to bear. Those who really wish to relieve the present stress of over-population would find, in giving pecuniary help to such a scheme, not

only sufficient interest upon whatever capital they might see fit to expend upon it, but would also confer a benefit upon many of the poor, who are well deserving of help in their struggles to improve. Wherever the system of workmen's dwellings has been tried it has never been known to fail. It has always given a great impulse to morality and economy. A spirit of emulation has been aroused, which was impossible, owing to mischievous environment, before, and contact with immoral characters has been thereby avoided. Those worthy of help, who are anxious to escape from degradation, have been helped to do so, to their own and the community's great advantage. The system needs a much wider expanse than it has had hitherto, for experience has proved its utility, its promise of vast benefit to many. That some schemes whereby permanent and regenerating good may be conferred upon the toilers of the day have now become necessary is palpable to all who have eyes to see or ears to hear. The difficulties crowding in upon our present system of artificial life, through unjust economic conditions, are day by day being forced into extremities. The married women who are compelled to undertake manual labour to add to the family exchequer, in consequence of their husband's insufficient earnings, are rapidly deteriorating in strength and stamina; consequently their children are born tired, enfeebled, and puny, manifestly unfitted to take their proper positions in life. This is now, alas! termed a battle; under just and humane conditions it would be a pleasure, not a struggle, in which the strong have to slay the weak. The girls who are compelled to labour intellectually for their bread are consequently rendered infertile, totally unfit to undergo the natural duties of maternity, compelled to live celibate lives, wholly contrary to the intention of God and nature, and which can only terminate in nervousness, disease, and despair. Young men, owing to their naturally stronger physical impulses, are driven into all sorts of immorality and vice. Marriage, the proper remedy for this untoward state of things, is rendered impossible, in consequence of the growth of luxurious living and the impossibility for married persons to attain to the pernicious standard which it requires. Insanity and suicide are largely increasing in consequence of all this artificial life. What will be the end of it all? Immoral limitation of children as a ready cure is being widely adopted, and by it men and women are transforming

themselves into mere sexual machines. Voluntarily, yet immorally, they are both anxious and content to forego the moral lawful duties of parentage. Unless a radical moral change permeates the vitals of modern life, unless urgently-needed reforms are soon introduced into our present economic constitution, the future, not only for England, but for Christian morality and civilization, must be overshadowed by a very dark cloud.

APPENDIX.

ne mortaliter homo qui concumbens cum uxore, se
I retrahit ante seminis emissionem? Peccat ille homo ; non
peccat vero uxor quæ non consentit.

Celina, solvens debitum conjugale, totam viri semen vel aliquam
ejus partem post concubitum expellit. Peccat mortaliter ; nisi
casu vel infirmitate illud expellat.

“ Le mariage n'est pas une association pour le plaisir ou même pour le bonheur ; sa fin immédiate et principale est d'assurer la perpétuité de la race humaine. C'est cette fin qui doit dominer tous les projets d'avenir, toutes les combinaisons. C'est aussi grâce à elle seule que l'harmonie intérieure, d'où résulte le bonheur, pourra s'établir. Car les deux époux d'accord sur une fin extérieure à eux, l'accroissement et la perpétuité de la famille, ne peuvent que s'entendre. Sur les choses principales, l'accord intérieur des âmes naîtra, s'il n'existe déjà, de cet accord supérieur des intelligences. Et c'est ainsi que s'explique la paix commune à tant de ménages Chrétiens où cependant les préliminaires et les engagements même avaient été bien étrangers aux prudences de la nature. Cette conception n'est autre, en effet, que la conception Chrétienne du mariage. Le mariage est fait sous la représentation des enfans futurs, à tel point que si cette représentation venait à être bannie du contrat par un accord exprès des parties, le mariage n'existerait pas. Par là le Christianisme, qui n'a fait que sanctifier et surélever les lois naturelles, assure en même temps la paix des ménages, le bonheur des époux et la durée des familles.”—YVES LE QUERDEC, *Le Monde*, October 28th, 1895.

PLYMOUTH :
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON,
PRINTERS.

